

James P. Boyd, Ray Brook, N. Y., in place of R. A. Lundy, retired.

#### NORTH CAROLINA

Harry L. Adams, Lake Lure, N. C., in place of A. B. Price, resigned.

W. Henry Lomax, Linwood, N. C., in place of W. L. Shoaf, deceased.

Ben S. Houston, Mooresville, N. C., in place of J. M. Kennette, deceased.

Elsie A. Paisley, Sedalia, N. C., in place of L. E. Andrew, retired.

George Isham Henderson, Tryon, N. C., in place of R. O. Andrews, resigned.

#### OKLAHOMA

Kinley Case, Paden, Okla., in place of Kinley Case. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William R. Smith, Tryon, Okla., in place of Loyd Barclay, transferred.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

Dean F. Wagner, Coalport, Pa., in place of R. E. Giles, deceased.

Raymond T. Stuckey, Newport, Pa., in place of W. G. Loy, deceased.

Charles W. Henne, Straoustown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

#### RHODE ISLAND

Hazel E. Durand, Hope, R. I., in place of B. M. Brayton, deceased.

Bertha J. Huntley, Longmeadow, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

#### SOUTH CAROLINA

Edmund P. Grice, Jr., Charleston, S. C., in place of P. M. Clement, resigned.

William W. Turner, Sr., Johnston, S. C., in place of J. H. Payne, retired.

Dorothy M. Bellamy, Pawleys Island, S. C., in place of W. F. Lachicotte, deceased.

William F. Adkins, Piedmont, S. C., in place of L. C. Lindsey, resigned.

#### VERMONT

Vera R. Perkins, Quechee, Vt., in place of L. L. Veyette, resigned.

#### WASHINGTON

Ernest W. Wendell, Grays River, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

LeRoy P. Jensen, Lopez, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

#### WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate July 12 (legislative day of July 10), 1947:

#### UNITED NATIONS

Francis Biddle, of Pennsylvania, representative of the United States of America in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

#### POSTMASTER

Frank E. Kline to be postmaster at Jones, in the State of Michigan.

## SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 14, 1947

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 10, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Clarence Cranford, D. D., minister, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, by whose grace we live and move and have our being, grant that we may have such a reverence for accuracy and such a respect for ideals that we may be able to serve well the day and generation in which we live.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 12, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Connor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eaton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair desires to make an announcement.

For the information of the Senate, the Chair wishes to report to his colleagues that at this morning's congressional conference at the White House the President confirmed the statement made Saturday evening by the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], regarding the timetable for the pending tax bill. The President stated that he will act promptly when the tax bill reaches him, and Congress will be promptly advised, so that there need be no interference with the adjournment schedule on this account.

The President also stated that he does not presently contemplate or anticipate a special session of the Congress next fall, although, of course, he must reserve to himself the right to act in the event of an emergency.

The Chair thought the Senate should have this direct information.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE BILL

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, announcement is hereby made that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which consists of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and myself, of which subcommittee I am chairman, is considering Senate bill 984 and will hold an open public hearing in respect to that bill on Wednesday, July 16, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m., and will hold another hearing with respect to said bill on Thursday, July 17, 1947, beginning at 10 a. m.

The hearings are scheduled to be held in the office of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Senate bill 984 is entitled "A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, and ancestry."

#### MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have been asked to request that the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate might sit during the present day's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. WHITE. I have also been asked to request that a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### TEMPORARY AID TO AND REPATRIATION OF UNITED STATES NATIONALS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize temporary aid to and repatriation of nationals of the United States in need in foreign countries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ALASKA CENTRAL ROAD SYSTEM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction of a road connecting the Kenai Peninsula, Alaska, with the central road system of the Territory (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works:

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

#### By Mr. TYDINGS:

Resolutions adopted by the Baltimore (Md.) Chapter of Hadassah, Inc., favoring the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A memorial of sundry railroad employees of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against certain provisions of the so-called Crosser bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act;

to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition of sundry members of the State Council of Maryland, Daughters of America, praying for the enactment of House bill 138 to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 100 or more, and sundry other legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A memorial of sundry members of the State Council of Maryland, Daughters of America, remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 36, to make available to certain European nationalities having small quotas the unused parts of the quotas of other European nationalities, and sundry other legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 885. A bill to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Afax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 512); and

H. R. 3598. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Pacific coast and creating the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission; with an amendment (Rept. No. 513).

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 3247. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 514); and

H. R. 3494. A bill to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the Regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 515).

H. R. 3672. A bill to create an Academic Advisory Board for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 516).

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3756. A bill making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 517).

By Mr. MCCARTHY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 421. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the entrance of the Utah pioneers into Salt Lake Valley on July 24, 1847; without amendment (Rept. No. 518).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1039. A bill for the relief of Ada B. Foss; without amendment (Rept. No. 519);

S. 1077. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to authorize commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to preside at the taking of evidence in proceedings under section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 520); and

H. R. 2746. A bill to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 521).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution authorizing the President to bring into effect an agree-

ment between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 522).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 310. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Jonah Williams; with amendments (Rept. No. 523);

S. 311. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Ghost Bear, Sr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 523);

S. 312. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Kills the Enemy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 524);

S. 313. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Calvin W. Clincher; with amendments (Rept. No. 529);

S. 499. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Bessie Two Elk-Poor Bear; with an amendment (Rept. No. 525);

S. 500. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Tom Eagleman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 526);

S. 542. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Ella White Bull; with amendments (Rept. No. 530);

S. 1372. A bill authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma to sell tribal cemetery; with an amendment (Rept. No. 527);

H. R. 205. A bill to amend the act approved May 7, 1934, granting citizenship to the Metlakatla Indians of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 532);

H. R. 734. A bill to amend the act of February 12, 1925, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 533);

H. R. 981. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; with amendments (Rept. No. 531);

H. R. 1337. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of \$50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 534);

H. R. 1486. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Alice Scott White a patent in fee to certain land; without amendment (Rept. No. 535);

H. R. 1882. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public-school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district; without amendment (Rept. No. 536);

H. R. 2097. A bill to declare the ownership of the timber on the allotments on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, and to authorize the sale thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 537);

H. R. 2151. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe; without amendment (Rept. No. 538);

H. R. 2484. A bill to authorize the payment of certain sums to jobbers in connection with their logging of timber for the Menominee Indians on the Menominee Reservation during the logging season 1934-35, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 539);

H. R. 2825. A bill to provide additional funds for cooperation with public-school districts (organized and unorganized) in Mahanomen, Itasca, Pine, Becker, and Cass Counties, Minn., in the construction, improvement, and extension of school facilities to be available to both Indian and white children; without amendment (Rept. No. 540);

H. R. 2885. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Becker Little Light; without amendment (Rept. No. 541);

H. R. 2886. A bill authorizing the sale, under supervision, of land of Richard Little Light; without amendment (Rept. No. 542);

H. R. 3173. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 543); and

H. R. 3323. A bill to enable the Osage Tribal Council to determine the bonus value of tracts offered for lease for oil, gas, and other mining purposes, Osage Mineral Reservation, Okla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 544).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1150. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Margert Pickett Yellowtail; with an amendment (Rept. No. 545).

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 14, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 129) to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

Br. Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

T. Vincent Quinn, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy;

Alton Adolor Lessard, of Maine, to be United States attorney, for the district of Maine, vice Hon. John D. Clifford, Jr., resigned;

Leo P. Flynn, of South Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota, vice George Philip, resigned; and

A. Roy Ashley, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina, vice Reuben Gosnell, term expired.

#### ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present an additional report of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to Federal personnel, and I request that the report, together with a statement by me, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report and statement presented by Mr. BYRD were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941, ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL, APRIL-MAY 1947

#### FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MAY 1947, AND COMPARISON WITH APRIL 1947

(All figures compiled from reports submitted by the heads of Federal establishments or their authorized representatives)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal personnel within the United States during the month of May decreased 19,334 from a total of 1,933,667 in April to 1,914,333



in May. Excluding War and Navy Departments, personnel decreased 7,411 from the April figure of 1,216,957 to the May figure of 1,209,546. The War Department within the continental United States decreased 8,828 from the April figure of 399,957 to the May figure of 391,129. The Navy Department within the United States decreased 3,095 from the April total of 316,753 to the May total of 313,658. (See table I.)

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 7,585 from the April total of 271,343 to the May total of 263,758. The majority of these were industrial workers. (See tables II and IV.)<sup>\*</sup> Exclusive of War and Navy Departments, there was a decrease of 802 from the April figure of 55,622 to the May figure of 55,320.

The consolidated table, presenting data with respect to personnel inside and outside the continental United States, shows a total decrease of 26,918 from the April total of 2,205,010 to the May total of 2,178,092. Excluding War and Navy Departments' reductions of 19,206, there was a decrease of 7,712 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from the April figure of 1,272,579 to the May figure of 1,264,867. (See table III.)

Industrial employment during the month of May decreased 6,695 from the April total of 603,064 to the May total of 596,369. War Department reductions outside the continental United States of 5,655 were offset by increase in employment within the United States, indicating a net decrease of 4,524 employees. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects, such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees. (See table IV.)

TABLE I.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1947, and comparison with April 1947

Departments or agencies	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)</b>			
Agriculture Department.....	83,121	88,909	+5,788
Commerce Department.....	35,181	35,916	+735
Interior Department.....	46,865	47,307	+442
Justice Department.....	24,294	24,293	-1
Labor Department.....	6,802	6,030	-772
Post Office Department.....	466,166	468,001	+1,835
State Department.....	8,227	8,084	-143
Treasury Department.....	101,490	98,414	-3,076

#### EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES

Office of Defense Transportation.....	98	96	-2
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	107	100	-7
Selective Service System.....	7,338	1,567	-5,771

#### POSTWAR AGENCIES

Council of Economic Advisers.....	42	42	-----
Office of Government Reports.....	141	139	-2
Office of Housing Expediter.....	1,365	9,253	+5,888
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of War Mobilization and Recon-			
version.....	103	-----	-103
Office of Price Admin-			
istration.....	9,204	1,115	-8,089
Civil Production Ad-			
ministration.....	723	-----	-723
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	2	2	-----
Price Decontrol Board.....	5	5	-----
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.....	4,225	4,165	-60
War Assets Administration.....	46,072	44,733	-1,339

<sup>1</sup> Adjusted over prior incorrect figure of 2,609.

TABLE I.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1947, and comparison with April 1947—Continued

Departments or agencies	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	3	3	-----
Bureau of the Budget.....	605	603	-2
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	530	532	+2
Civil Service Commission.....	3,505	3,476	-29
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	118	115	-3
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,313	1,306	-7
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,180	1,170	-10
Federal Power Commission.....	775	766	-9
Federal Security Agency.....	32,878	32,487	-391
Federal Trade Commission.....	587	584	-3
Federal Works Agency.....	24,618	24,694	+76
General Accounting Office.....	10,895	10,759	-136
Government Printing Office.....	7,932	7,884	-48
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,280	2,271	-9
Maritime Commission.....	10,700	10,900	+110
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	5,833	5,897	+64
National Archives.....	396	394	-2
National Capital Housing Authority.....	281	283	+2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	18	18	-----
National Gallery of Art.....	306	311	+5
National Housing Agency.....	15,311	14,937	-374
National Labor Relations Board.....	837	824	-13
National Mediation Board.....	106	111	+5
Panama Canal.....	529	554	+25
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,767	2,673	-94
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	7,782	7,723	-59
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,186	1,170	-16
Smithsonian Institution.....	509	504	-5
Tariff Commission.....	228	231	+3
Tax Court of the United States.....	123	123	-----
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	13,884	14,098	+214
Veterans' Administration.....	225,281	223,974	-1,307
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments.....	1,216,957	1,209,546	-7,411
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments.....			-7,411
Navy Department.....	316,753	313,658	-3,095
War Department.....	399,957	391,129	-8,828
Total, including War and Navy Departments.....	1,933,667	1,914,333	-19,334
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments.....			-19,334

TABLE II.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1947, as compared with April 1947

Departments or agencies	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)</b>			
Agriculture Department.....	1,330	1,459	+129
Commerce Department.....	2,853	3,082	+229
Interior Department.....	4,005	4,421	+416
Justice Department.....	442	382	-60
Labor Department.....	101	84	-17
Post Office Department.....	1,427	1,472	+45
State Department.....	13,670	13,671	+1
Treasury Department.....	742	710	-32
<b>EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES</b>			
Selective Service System.....	80	27	-53

TABLE II.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1947, as compared with April 1947—Continued

Departments or agencies	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>POSTWAR AGENCIES</b>			
Office of Housing Expediter.....	16	44	+28
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of Price Admin-			
istration.....	32	-----	-32
Civilian Production Administration.....	1	-----	-1
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	83	96	+13
War Assets Administration.....	468	487	+19
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	90	95	+5
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	13	13	-----
Civil Service Commission.....	5	5	-----
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	1	1	-----
Federal Communications Commission.....	36	36	-----
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	3	3	-----
Federal Security Agency.....	852	1,106	+254
Federal Works Agency.....	320	319	-1
Maritime Commission.....	333	324	-9
National Housing Agency.....	48	47	-1
National Labor Relations Board.....	2	2	-----
Panama Canal.....	26,123	25,477	-646
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	110	122	+12
Smithsonian Institution.....	8	8	-----
Veterans' Administration.....	1,828	1,827	-1
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments.....	55,622	55,320	-302
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments.....			-302
Navy Department.....	53,564	52,403	-1,161
War Department.....	162,157	156,035	-6,122
Total, including War and Navy Departments.....	271,343	263,758	-7,585
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments.....			-7,585

<sup>1</sup> Adjusted from previous figure of 12.

<sup>2</sup> Figures as of Mar. 31, 1947.

<sup>3</sup> As of Apr. 30, 1947.

TABLE III.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1947

Departments or agencies	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)</b>			
Agriculture Department.....	84,451	90,368	+5,917
Commerce Department.....	38,034	38,998	+964
Interior Department.....	51,470	51,728	+258
Justice Department.....	24,736	24,675	-61
Labor Department.....	6,903	6,114	-789
Post Office Department.....	467,593	469,473	+1,880
State Department.....	21,897	21,755	-142
Treasury Department.....	102,232	99,124	-3,108
<b>EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES</b>			
Office of Defense Transportation.....	98	96	-2
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	107	100	-7
Selective Service System.....	7,418	1,594	-5,824
<b>POSTWAR AGENCIES</b>			
Council of Economic Advisers.....	42	42	-----
Office of Government Reports.....	141	139	-2

TABLE III.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1947—Continued

Departments or agencies	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>POSTWAR AGENCIES—CON.</b>			
Office of Housing Expediter	1,381	9,297	+5,916
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of War Mobilization and Reconstruction	102		-103
Office of Price Administration	9,236	1,115	-8,121
Civilian Production Administration	724		-724
Philippine Alien Property Administration	85	98	+13
Price Decontrol Board	5	5	
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,225	4,166	-59
War Assets Administration	46,540	45,220	-1,320
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
American Battle Monuments Commission	93	98	+5
Bureau of the Budget	605	609	+2
Civil Aeronautics Board	543	545	+2
Civil Service Commission	3,510	3,481	-29
Export-Import Bank of Washington	119	116	-3
Federal Communications Commission	1,349	1,342	-7
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,183	1,173	-10
Federal Power Commission	775	766	-9
Federal Security Agency	33,730	33,593	-137
Federal Trade Commission	587	584	-3
Federal Works	24,938	25,013	+75
General Accounting Office	10,895	10,759	-136
Government Printing Office	7,932	7,884	-48
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,280	2,271	-9
Maritime Commission	11,123	11,224	+101
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,833	5,897	+64
National Archives	396	394	-2
National Capital Housing Authority	281	283	+2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	18	18	
National Gallery of Art	306	311	+5
National Housing Agency	15,359	14,984	-375
National Labor Relations Board	839	826	-13
National Mediation Board	106	111	+5
Panama Canal	26,652	26,031	-621
Railroad Retirement Board	2,767	2,672	-94
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,892	7,845	-47
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,186	1,170	-16
Smithsonian Institution	517	512	-5
Tariff Commission	228	231	+3
Tax Court of the United States	123	123	
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,884	14,098	+214
Veterans' Administration	227,100	225,801	-1,308
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,272,579	1,234,867	-37,712
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			-7,712
Navy Department	370,317	366,061	-4,256
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	399,957	391,129	-8,828
Outside continental United States	162,157	156,035	-6,122
Total, including War and Navy Departments	2,205,010	2,178,092	-26,918
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			-26,918

<sup>1</sup> Adjusted from previously reported figure of 2,621.

<sup>2</sup> As of Mar. 31, 1947.

<sup>3</sup> As of Apr. 30, 1947.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees<sup>1</sup> of the Federal Government, inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during May 1947

Departments or agencies	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)</b>			
Commerce Department	1,269	1,310	+41
Interior Department	6,627	7,209	+582
State Department	334	318	-16
Treasury Department	4,781	4,590	-191
<b>POSTWAR AGENCIES</b>			
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	563	557	-6
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
National Housing Agency	11	10	-1
Panama Canal	2,292	2,241	-51
Tennessee Valley Authority	6,802	7,007	+205
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	22,709	23,242	+533
Net increase, excluding War and Navy Departments			+533
Navy Department	256,613	253,909	-2,704
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	193,298	194,429	+1,131
Outside continental United States	130,444	124,789	-5,655
Total, including War and Navy Departments	603,064	596,369	-6,695
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			-6,695

<sup>1</sup> Industrial employees include unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled and supervisory employees on construction projects; maintenance and custodial workers not included.

<sup>2</sup> As of Mar. 31, 1947.

**STATEMENT MADE BY SENATOR HARRY BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE WITH REFERENCE TO FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL**

Today, Senator BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, released a monthly report of personnel activities for the month of May 1947. According to a compilation of monthly personnel reports submitted to the committee, the consolidated table which presents data on an over-all basis, shows a total decrease of 26,918 from the April total of 2,205,010 to the May total of 2,178,092. If the War and Navy Department figures are deducted from these totals, the over-all decrease is reduced from 26,918 to 7,712. While the War and Navy Departments decreased 19,206 during the month, the other departments increased 15,424.

Personnel within the continental United States decreased 19,334 from a total of 1,933,667 in April to 1,914,333 in May. By excluding the War and Navy Departments the report shows that personnel decreased only 7,411 from the April figure of 1,216,957 to the May figure of 1,209,546. The War Department within the continental United States decreased during May 8,828, from the April figure of 399,957 to the May figure of 391,129. The Navy Department within the United States decreased 3,095, from the April total of 316,753 to the May total of 313,658. Therefore it is obvious that of the 19,334 reduction in personnel the War and Navy Departments are responsible for 11,923 of that figure.

The April total of personnel outside the continental United States was 271,343. This

figure was decreased 7,585 to a May total of 263,758, the majority of which was industrial workers. By excluding the War and Navy Departments from this figure the decrease is reduced 302.

Industrial employment during the month of May decreased 6,695 from the April total of 603,064 to the May total of 596,369. War Department reductions of 5,655 outside the continental United States were offset by an increase within the United States, showing a net decrease of 4,524. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects, such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS**

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
July 8, 1947.

**TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:**

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it for the period from January 1, 1947, to June 30, 1947, together with the funds appropriated to and expended by it:

Smith, Everard H., chief clerk, gross annual salary, \$10,000.

Tolbert, Cecil H., assistant chief clerk, gross annual salary, \$8,997.45.

Teague, Adelbert F., assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$7,075.06.

Fox, Helen C., to February 28, 1947, assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$3,461.04.

Baker, Grayson F., to January 31, 1947, assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$4,205.91.

Mills, Charles M., from February 7, 1947, to March 25, 1947, assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$7,075.06.

Downey, Herman E., assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$5,447.37.

Jeneau, Marie, clerical assistant, gross annual salary, \$3,461.04.

Wassam, Bernadine, from February 18, 1947, clerical assistant, gross annual salary, \$3,047.22.

King, Edmund T., from March 1, 1947, assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$7,075.06.

Yanick, Mary K., from April 1, 1947, clerical assistant, gross annual salary, \$3,212.74.

Joyce, H. Maurice, from April 7, 1947, to April 30, 1947, clerical assistant, gross annual salary, \$6,026.72.

Franks, Mary S., from May 6, 1947, clerical assistant, gross annual salary, \$2,909.28.

Darling, Philip M., from May 1, 1947, assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$7,075.06.

Montgomery, Robert H., from March 15, 1947, professional staff member, gross annual salary, \$8,023.09.

Thomas, John F., from March 20, 1947, professional staff member, gross annual salary, \$8,023.09.

Knight, Hale G., from April 2, 1947, professional staff member, gross annual salary, \$7,470.07.

Hewitt, Francis S., from May 1, 1947, professional staff member, gross annual salary, \$7,075.06.

Graves, Thomas J., from May 1, 1947, professional staff member, gross annual salary, \$8,023.09.

Cooper, Earl W., assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$7,549.08.

Merrick, Harold E., assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$7,812.42.



Scott, Thomas J., assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$7,549.08.

Gravlin, Leslie M., from March 5, 1947, consultant, \$35 per diem.

Jones, Arnold W., from March 15, 1947, assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$7,075.06.

Paulson, Helen W., from March 25, 1947, to March 27, 1947, assistant clerk, \$4.67 per diem.

Dodd, Alice M., from April 25, 1947, to May 6, 1947, assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$1,463.

Case, H. C. M., from May 12, 1947, consultant (temporary), gross annual salary, \$10,000.

Joyce, H. Maurice, from May 1, 1947, assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$6,026.72.

Futterer, Marianne S., from June 16, 1947, to June 28, 1947, assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$3,129.98.

Funds appropriated, \$108,544.74.

Funds expended, \$26,071.97.

STYLES BRIDGES,  
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,  
July 1, 1947.

#### TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned Armed Services Committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it for the period from January 3, 1947, to June 30, 1947, together with the funds appropriated to and expended by it:

Adams, John G., committee clerk, gross annual salary, \$8,023.29.

Atkinson, Herbert S., assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$5,281.24.

Chambers, Justice M., staff adviser, gross annual salary, \$9,050.11.

Earle, Georgia B., clerical assistant, gross annual salary, \$3,626.50.

Galusha, Mark H., staff adviser, gross annual salary, \$9,050.11.

Mudge, Verne D., staff adviser, gross annual salary, \$9,050.11.

Murphy, Katherine K., clerical assistant, gross annual salary, \$3,047.22.

Posey, Irene, clerical assistant, gross annual salary, \$3,626.50.

Smalley, Walter L., assistant clerk, gross annual salary, \$5,281.24.

Van Beek, Roberta, clerical assistant, gross annual salary, \$3,626.56.

Funds appropriated, \$10,000.

Funds expended, \$2,759.25.<sup>2</sup>

CHAN GURNEY,  
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,  
June 30, 1947.

#### TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned Committee on Public Works, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it for the period from January 3, 1947, to June 30, 1947, together with the funds appropriated to and expended by it:

Committee staff:

E. W. Bassett, professional staff, gross annual salary, \$10,000.

Ronald Moist, professional staff, gross annual salary, \$10,000.

William A. Stevens, clerical staff, gross annual salary, \$7,944.09.

Eloise Porter, clerical staff, gross annual salary, \$4,838.02.

Jeanette H. Grooms, clerical staff, gross annual salary, \$2,964.45.

<sup>1</sup> Employment terminated April 1, 1947.

<sup>2</sup> Approximate. Certain bills for reporting hearings have not been received and are estimated.

Norma Christenson, clerical staff, gross annual salary, \$2,964.45.

Frances Stovall, clerical staff, gross annual salary, \$4,619.73.

Funds appropriated (under Reorganization Act), \$10,000.

Funds expended: Amounts expended for holding hearings, \$1,836.62; amounts expended for witnesses, etc., \$415; total, \$2,251.62.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,  
Chairman.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1624. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1625. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1626. A bill for the relief of Herman L. Weiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1627. A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 596), entitled "Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of myself and other Senators to introduce a bill for appropriate reference. The purpose of the bill is to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, lock, stock, and barrel.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1628. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1629. A bill to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF OFFICERS OF ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. OVERTON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

#### INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES IN FIFTH MISSOURI CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY—MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 116, to investigate the nonaction of the Department of Justice in connection with the alleged irregulari-

ties in the Democratic primary election in the Fifth Missouri Congressional District, of August 6, 1946. I request that the resolution lie over, under the rule.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 150), was received, and ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 116) to investigate the nonaction of the Department of Justice in connection with alleged irregularities in the Democratic primary election in the Fifth Missouri Congressional District on August 6, 1946.

#### SETTLEMENT OF COAL STRIKE—STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued and released today by the President of the United States discussing the impact and effect of the increase in the wages of coal miners upon the cost of living, with particular reference to the cost of coal and steel to the American people. It is a very thoughtful and constructive discussion which I hope the American people and the Congress will take seriously to heart.

I wish to quote one sentence in the next to the last paragraph of the statement issued by the President, as follows:

It is only reasonable to ask coal and steel producers to wait until a fair test has been made of the actual effects of the wage advances under conditions of maximum production. If prices are raised at once and a wave of increases in related prices upsets our economy, we never will know what would have happened if the coal and steel managers had been willing to wait.

I think we might well take that admonition to ourselves not only with respect to the effect of the increases in the wages of coal miners upon the prices of coal and steel, but we might well take to heart our own willingness to wait until we see a little further ahead with respect to the effect upon our economy not only of wage increases but of inventories and decreases in the taxes as proposed by the bill now under consideration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Deep concern is being expressed in many quarters over possible results of the recent settlement between the miners and the coal operators. It is widely feared that this settlement may lead to a substantial increase in the price of coal, which is an important factor on the cost sheets of American industry, and that this would in turn induce an increase in commodity prices and renew the inflationary spiral which we had much reason to hope had been halted.

This would be a serious blow to our economy and to the continuance of the present high level of production and employment. But such a blow need not fall upon us.

The effect of the wage settlement is badly misrepresented by the bare statement that it amounts to an increase of about 45 cents per hour in the wages of miners. It is unfortunate that the public does not yet fully understand, through the complicated details of the agreement, what is the actual impact of this settlement upon the cost of producing coal.

The major features of the wage settlement are these: The miners receive a daily wage of \$13.05 instead of \$11.85, this being the \$1.20 increase recently awarded in other major industries. The working day becomes 8 hours at straight rates instead of 9 hours, of which 7 hours have been at straight-time rates and 2 hours have been at overtime premium rates. Overtime is paid for Saturday work only if it has been preceded by 5 days of work in that week, and the employers will no longer find their schedules disorganized by the inclination of some miners to work on the overtime Saturday and to lay off on some other day. The employers also pay an additional 5 cents per ton into the welfare fund.

When the most important coal operators and steel producers in the country made this settlement, they asserted that it would be of great benefit to the country by making it possible to continue full production and employment for a long period. We can all agree that a coal strike would have seriously endangered our prosperity. But whether this settlement does permit that prosperity to continue depends in very large degree upon the decisions of these business managers themselves as to how they will deal with their costs and prices in the light of this settlement.

In their explanation to the public and to their stockholders of the reasons which led them to make this contract, these business leaders have emphasized the desirability of certain provisions and conditions which they assert will increase productivity and offset a considerable part of the increase in money wage rates. It is quite impossible for them, they say, to make any estimate of the savings in costs which will accrue from the regularized workday and workweek, from the increased effort of workers who enjoy better wages and greater security, and from the improvement in plant efficiency which it is always the duty of management to create and in the present situation is even more emphatically the obligation of these managers to secure.

In view of the uncertainty as to whether or how mine costs of coal may be raised, the people of the country have the right to demand that their prosperity shall not be imperiled by immediate increases in the price of coal and in the price of steel. It is only reasonable to ask coal and steel producers to wait until a fair test has been made of the actual effects of the wage advances under conditions of maximum production. If prices are raised at once and a wave of increases in related prices upsets our economy, we never will know what would have happened if the coal and steel managers had been willing to wait.

The risk involved by continuing present prices of coal and steel long enough to learn what the increased costs of production will actually be under the new wage agreement is not serious, especially in view of the fact that such action will greatly reduce the hazards of renewed inflation. The producers of coal and steel have been enjoying their full share of the high profits which are flowing to industry today in our present prosperous economy. I am sure that they, as responsible leaders of industry, will want to invest a portion of those profits in the maintenance of business stability and prosperity for all our people.

#### REDUCTION IN ARMY RESERVE FLIER TRAINING

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record an Associated Press article published on the front page of today's Washington Post under the heading "Army Reserve flier training cut to a third." Several days ago I voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] pro-

viding for an increase in the appropriation for the Army Air Forces, believing that additional funds were necessary if the Army Air Forces Reserve should continue to function.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ARMY RESERVE FLIER TRAINING CUT TO A THIRD—REDUCTION IN BUDGET HITS TEACHING STAFFS, CREWS, AND FACILITIES

The Army Air Forces said yesterday that because of its budget-trimmed program only 9,766 of the 28,630 reserve flying officers who enrolled for part-time training are receiving such training.

The reduced funds are limiting teaching staffs, maintenance crews and training facilities, said an announcement in connection with the forthcoming celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the AAF on August 1.

The Air National Guard is now organized with 8,512 officers and men while the planned strength is 57,946. When at full strength, the air element of the guard will consist of 84 squadrons, of which 12 will be light bombardment and the remainder fighter outfits, the AAF said.

In addition to conventional-type fighters—P-51's and P-47's—the announcement said that "it is also contemplated that some Air National Guard fighter squadrons will receive jet-propelled Lockheed P-80 Shooting Stars within the next 12 months."

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS ON FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVERS AND HARBORS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement I made today before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee considering House bill 4002, flood control and rivers and harbors appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON H. R. 4002, FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVERS AND HARBORS APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING JULY 1, 1947

I think the members of this committee have been fully impressed with the fact that on these vital appropriations for flood control and rivers and harbors work the budget of the President, far from being bloated and extravagant, is actually bone-bare and far from adequate. The House conceded that in some specific instances in connection with these appropriations and provided more money than the budget has recommended. In other instances the House allowed every single cent of the budget amounts. Nevertheless, committed as it is to sweeping economy, the House proceeded to make numerous substantial cuts in individual projects.

I am coming before you today for a number of reasons, first and foremost among them the fact that I hope this committee, as it has done in previous instances, will recognize the urgent necessity for placing dollar economy second to people's lives and health and safety. Some of the cuts made by the House in budget recommendations for individual projects do not in themselves appear to be too severe but an analysis of them shows that they merely postpone work everyone recognizes must be done eventually and that the sooner it is done the less prospect there is for these rivers going wild and causing untold damages, swirling around uncompleted flood walls and partially completed reservoir structures to bring real suf-

fering to hundreds and thousands of our citizens.

I have noticed a tendency in the past on the part of the Senate Appropriations Committee, while repairing the damage to our many existing Federal programs as contemplated in severe cuts made by the House of Representatives, to try to find items in the budget not cut by the House or items where the House has provided more than the budget recommendations, and to make Senate cuts in these items. I think it is largely true that whenever the Senate has reported out a bill substantially restoring funds cut by the House in important programs it has proceeded to pick out several substantial items where the House has been fully convinced of the necessity for the funds it has voted, and the Senate committee has cut them. This happened in the Labor Department appropriation bill particularly, where the House, after cutting most of the funds for the United States Employment Service National Office, had nevertheless voted the full budget amount for the individual State employment services. The Senate restored much of the funds for the USES and then turned around and made such a deep slash in the appropriation for the various individual State employment agencies that the final Senate bill, even though it was far more realistic than the House bill as to almost every program of the Labor Department, nevertheless ended up, because of this deep cut of many millions of dollars in the State employment services, at a lower total than the House bill.

One of the first things I want to impress upon the committee in connection with these flood control and rivers and harbors appropriations is that in my opinion the House committee has examined every project pretty thoroughly in an effort to cut the amounts as deeply as possible—much too deep, I think—but that the attention to detail they have shown on each of these items indicates that wherever the House failed to make a cut or wherever it went so far as to provide more money than the budget recommended, they did so only after being thoroughly convinced of the urgent necessity.

Anticipating that this committee in the Senate might be inclined to question any particular item where the House failed to make a cut or where it provided more money than the budget had recommended, I would like to point out that in these projects in Pennsylvania where this occurred, projects with which I am thoroughly acquainted, the need for this money is compelling. Any attempt on the part of the Senate to balance off some of the severe cuts made by the House by restoring some of the money and then taking it away from projects where the House did not cut or where the House allowed more than the budget amount, would be most unfair and would be an attempt to do what we all accuse the Communist Party of trying to do, and that is standardize poverty.

For instance, the budget provided only \$3,200,000 for the Conemaugh Reservoir on the Conemaugh River, the key reservoir in a series of dams designed to protect the great city of Pittsburgh from a repetition of that disastrous flood of 1936 which, had it occurred during the war, would have been a greater blow to America than was the Pearl Harbor attack, because such a flood would have smothered war production in the very arsenal of our country's fighting force.

The House committee and the House itself, after receiving the most thoroughgoing analysis of the importance of full speed ahead on the Conemaugh Reservoir, disregarded the budget recommendations—recommendations which I have always maintained ever since they were announced last January are far too small—and voted \$5,200,000 for this project, or an increase of \$2,000,000 over the budget amounts. I am fearful that this \$2,000,000 might strike the eye of the Senate



committee as one place where you could cut the House figure, in view of the fact that you no doubt will be increasing the House figures on many other projects.

The budget figure of \$3,200,000 for the Conemaugh River Reservoir represents what the Budget Bureau thinks should be allocated for this reservoir out of a bone-bare budget. In other words, the Budget Bureau has a very small pie to divide for flood control this year, and so it has cut the size of each piece out of that pie and has cut it proportionately just about across the board, to mix a metaphor. The engineers, who are the people most familiar with the needs and with the urgency of these various projects, know that the \$3,200,000 recommended by the Budget Bureau for the Conemaugh Reservoir was far from sufficient. They were not allowed to say so, however, until members of the House committee asked them exactly how much they did need in order to continue operations on this project at the speed the engineers know to be necessary; the engineers thereupon reported this \$5,200,000 figure. The House committee and the House were so impressed by the unanimous insistence of not only the people of Pittsburgh but of the entire western Pennsylvania area that this project was so vital to the future of one of our greatest industrial regions and to the actual safety of the United States itself that it voted the full \$5,200,000.

I therefore ask that this committee review this project will all of those considerations in mind and I am sure that if you do so you will agree that the budget amount here was far from adequate, was wholly inadequate, and that the full amount voted by the House should be upheld also in the Senate.

There is another project in Pennsylvania where the House allowed more than the budget recommendations and that is in connection with the flood walls for Punxsutawney, Pa. As I feared last January when the over-all flood control recommendations were made public, the total amounts recommended were not sufficient to provide sufficient funds where they were needed and events have borne out my fear, for the budget provided no money for Punxsutawney. I asked the House committee to provide as much as it possibly could this year of the \$1,463,000 needed to complete this very urgent project. The House committee and the House did provide \$400,000, which is something, which is a little, but which is far, far from enough. In this case, I am asking not only that you not seize on this item as one which is above the budget and make a cut in it but also that because this \$400,000 is so little compared to the need, that you actually boost it substantially. One unit of this project is between 90 and 100 percent of completion but until the second unit is substantially completed the protection it will accord will be far from adequate. Industrial plants, utilities, municipal properties, railroads, and highways along with thousands of people and 300 commercial establishments are in jeopardy until the project is completed. There is only about \$100,000 of unobligated funds available from previous appropriations and I am informed that if the engineers had the money they could just about complete much of the work on unit 2 of this project during the present fiscal year.

I have started out with these two projects, Conemaugh Reservoir and the Punxsutawney project because of this tendency I have noticed on the part of the Senate committee in the past to cut House items which are at or above the budget merely as a balancing mechanism when restoring many of the terrific cuts made by the House in other items where the need is also great. I sincerely hope you will not cut Conemaugh and that you will add to funds for Punxsutawney.

#### WILLIAMSPORT, PA.

I asked the House committee to provide at least three million and preferably four mil-

lion dollars for the flood walls at Williamsport or about as much as has so far been spent on the project. I did not know at the time what the budget recommendation would be but I assumed, as I did on most projects, that in trying to make this little pie, the small total amount contemplated by the President in his economy drive for flood control, go as far as possible, the amount recommended for Williamsport would not be adequate. My fear was borne out when the actual budget figure for Williamsport of \$2,436,000 was made public. To my chagrin, however, the House even cut this small amount and provided only \$1,636,000.

In the priority list which the engineers made public way back in September of 1945 for flood-control projects which had been delayed or abandoned during the war, the Williamsport project rated a No. 1 priority listing. It was urgent then; it is infinitely more urgent now in view of the fact that Williamsport in May of 1946 suffered its second disastrous flood in 10 years, sustaining damage estimated at nearly \$9,000,000. Ten years before, the same community had been hit by its record flood which cost them \$10,500,000 or more. This project is designed to provide protection to Williamsport and the Borough of South Williamsport against Susquehanna River floods 4 feet higher than that 1936 flood which was the highest flood of record there. In May of 1946, when a lesser flood caused almost as much damage as their record flood of 10 years before, the citizens of Williamsport found little solace in the fact that had their partially completed flood walls been finished prior to the 1946 flood this latest disaster would not have touched them at all, they would have been high and dry. Instead they watched the waters curl around the partially completed dykes and swirl through the openings and inundate the entire business section and devastate the community.

During the war with the shortage of men, of materials, and other factors the patriotic citizens of Williamsport of course recognized the fact that the United States had some very important things on its collective mind and that if delaying their flood-control project was going to help shorten the war they could not object to their own personal inconvenience in view of the sacrifices so many Americans were then making in that war. Times are different now. The material and the manpower are available for full speed ahead on this work. The urgency of the work has never been questioned. In terms of dollars and cents, delay is ridiculous because an \$8,000,000 flood, translated into terms of deductions in income-tax payments under the heading of fires, flood, storms, and so on, means a very substantial loss to Uncle Sam as well as to the people of Williamsport who suffered through these floods.

Thus I can see no justification in the world for the House action in reducing a budget recommendation which was already manifestly too low. I ask that this committee not only restore the budget amount on this project but to go further and provide enough so that this project can be completed as quickly as possible. Saving nickles and dimes—and you are not actually saving any money just by putting off paying out money you know you have to spend eventually anyway—but making these so-called savings merely for fiscal bookkeeping purposes at the expense of people's lives and safety is an intolerable abuse of economic common sense.

#### SUNBURY

Sunbury's situation is substantially the same as Williamsport's. As in the case of Williamsport only about one-third of the money actually needed to complete the project has so far been provided in previous appropriation bills and about \$3,000,000 is still needed. Just as happened in Williamsport, Sunbury was hit by a record flood on the Susquehanna River in 1936 and 10 years

later was hit again by another flood, this time causing damage estimated at \$1,800,000. Had the flood walls now under construction been completed in May of 1946 there would have been no damage. The engineers report that Sunbury is extremely vulnerable to floods. I think that is a sufficient and compelling argument for the most expeditious work on this project and so I ask that the House cut here be restored and that, as a matter of fact, even more money be appropriated.

I hope I have made clear that I do not think the budget recommendations for any of these projects are sufficient. Although the budget recommended \$1,369,000 for this fiscal year I think we should provide at least \$1,500,000 so that by this time next year the work can be about two-thirds completed. The House has allowed only \$1,169,000.

This is false economy. Floods are continually getting worse as the years go by, as our forests are denuded and as river channels fill up, and when we know that a city very vulnerable to floods can be damaged by nearly \$2,000,000 in a sudden flash flood and that it will only cost \$3,000,000 or so to protect that city for the foreseeable future against any and all floods, then I say saving money on the books in any one year while knowing that we are going to have to pay the money eventually is not economy—it is absurdity.

#### EAST BRANCH, CLARION RIVER RESERVOIR

Even though this project was not included in the budget, I ask the House to provide at least \$1,500,000 to augment the \$500,000 voted for it last year. The House gave some study to this project but ended up without voting any money. I am sorry it did not and I think that here, too, there has been false economy. The money now available will, according to the engineers, not allow very much work to be done. The annual economic benefits of this project are estimated at about \$375,000, that is, a year. The total cost of the project is estimated at somewhere around seven million, or about 5 percent a year. At that rate it would pay itself off as an investment within a relatively short time. That is the dollar and cents aspect. But if you saw some of the mail I have received from people in Johnsonburg and Ridgway and St. Marys and other communities in the Elk County area, where a flood just a few years ago caused untold suffering and havoc and loss of lives, you would realize that dollars and cents, although certainly important, are by no means the only compelling factors in a situation of this sort. Some of the people in the area find it hard to understand our providing funds in the hundreds of millions of dollars for relief and for strategic purposes abroad when there is so much difficulty in getting relatively small appropriations through Congress for matters as urgent as this project to that whole area. Now, of course, I believe in our foreign policy program and have supported it wholeheartedly ever since I came to the Congress in 1939. To me it is not a question of whether we have to eliminate flood control or pinch pennies on flood control or delay flood control for bookkeeping purposes in order to carry out our obligations and commitments abroad. Both the flood control and the foreign program are urgent in their own rights and we must do both. We can do both. We have heard extensive testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the relative soundness of America's economy and of the prospects for continued high levels of employment, production, and national income if only we can obtain some moderation on prices and, this being so, I think it is imperative that we protect the sources of that prosperity and that national income by affording protection from floods which devastate whole communities and cripple farm and industrial output.

#### OTHER PROJECTS

The House made a 50-percent cut of \$2,000,000 in budget estimates for plans and speci-

fications for flood control. I think this is sorry economy. There are many important projects in Pennsylvania, authorized by Congress and now in the planning stage which will be held up materially if this cut stands. Among them are the Allegheny River Reservoir, for which the budget asked \$75,000 in planning funds; the Bear Creek Reservoir above the Lehigh River designed to protect Allentown and Bethlehem, for which \$100,000 was asked; the Turtle Creek Reservoir, intended to further strengthen flood control in the western Pennsylvania and Ohio Valley area, for which the estimate was \$60,000; work at Ridgway, Johnsonburg, Brockway, and vicinity for which \$25,000 was scheduled; and at Tyrone, Pa., for which \$81,500 was the budget's estimate. I assume that if the planning funds of \$4,000,000 asked by the budget and including these items I have just mentioned is cut in half to \$2,000,000, that the cuts against individual items will be proportionate. There is such a big backlog of work of a planning nature waiting to be done and the necessity is so compelling for having these plans ready and waiting for use instantly when construction funds are available, which will, I hope, be soon, that I am asking his committee to approach this problem from a practical standpoint and to undo the damage evident in the House action.

#### RIVERS AND HARBORS

Among rivers and harbors items, I find that the House has refused to appropriate any of the \$500,000 recommended by the Budget Bureau for the Delaware River between Philadelphia and the sea. The budget estimate itself was very low, not nearly enough. Now we find that nothing, not even part of this inadequate budget amount, has been recommended by the House. I want to say that Philadelphia's future is closely bound up with this necessary work at her port. Present anchorages are not adequate for the newer vessels and for the type of traffic we want to maintain as users of our port. The congestion there has been substantial and aggravating and, I think, unnecessary in view of the fact that it could be corrected with such a comparatively small outlay as the \$7,000,000 or so needed to complete a project on which the Federal Government has already spent nearly \$35,000,000. The \$500,000 sought by the budget would be spent largely on continuation of work at Marcus Hook, but there is also much work yet to be done in channel deepening and in anchorage work at Port Richmond and Mantua Creek. The work is necessary in the interest of economy—that is the engineers' own evaluation of it, and their word carries weight with me—and in the interest of safety and of expediting existing and prospective commerce consisting of petroleum, petroleum products, coal, lumber, grain, raw sugar, molasses, raw materials for industrial plants, and many manufactured articles. I ask that in addition to restoring the budget amount of \$500,000 you allow at least an additional \$500,000 for continuation of other work in that area. The existing authorized project for the Delaware River, particularly in the Philadelphia area, is sufficient to meet the needs of the area if the project is allowed to continue at expeditious speed.

The House failed to provide any of the \$200,000 recommended by the Budget Bureau for open channel work on the Ohio River. The problem there is similar to the one of the Delaware in that it is one of the greatest avenues of water-borne commerce in America and I ask you to review this item with the intent of determining the full need and providing funds for it. Steel and coal and iron ore and many, many other items of strategic importance to our country move in great volume on the Ohio and its tributaries and maintenance of open channels to a sufficient depth there is as urgent as efficient operation of our railroads and of our highway routes.

#### NEW PROJECTS

Because of the President's sincere desire to cut his 1948 fiscal year budget as much as he thought he could safely cut it, to the final figure of \$37,500,000,000, he provided for a delay in the start of any new flood control or rivers and harbors projects for which initial construction appropriations had not already been made. I have always opposed this policy because I know that the urgency of a project does not necessarily find reflection in the fact that it has already received an initial appropriation for construction. For instance, there are areas in Pennsylvania which have plans under way to curb flood evils which have been consistently manifested over the years and the mere fact that they were not among the very first after the war to receive initial construction appropriations does not mean they are any the less urgent. Knowing that the mood of Congress is to cut and cut and cut and to begrudge the budget estimates and to rise almost in indignation at anything over the budget, nevertheless I sincerely think that this committee, after studying the situation in regard to floods and after realizing what is happening in the Midwest and after weighing all the factors will join me in the conclusion that we cannot afford to delay the start of urgent projects just because they have not so far received initial construction appropriations. I would like to see money provided for construction for the projects I listed above as being recommended for planning funds; I would like to see money for Latrobe, Pa., for construction where planning work has been largely completed, and I would like to see the engineers given greater flexibility than this waterways budget, which I consider a bone-bare budget, gives them.

Among those new projects in rivers and harbors which are held up because initial construction appropriations have not been made is the one in the city of Philadelphia to widen and deepen the Schuylkill River. A total of about \$2,000,000 was authorized for this work between the mouth of the Schuylkill and the Passyunk Avenue Bridge and from there to the University Bridge. There is no reason in the world why the Congress must be bound by Budget Bureau hesitancy on starting new projects. The Congress has certainly not been bound by Budget Bureau estimates of needs in many of the other programs of Government when it came to cutting these estimates, sometimes drastically, and so I ask that you show independent judgment on this particular phase of allowing new projects to start. We are building up a tremendous backlog of rivers and harbors work, work which must be done, and the longer we let it go without getting to work on any of these new projects the more colossal a task will confront us in later years.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR MYERS AND ROBERT M. WILSON

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I recently received from a constituent in opposition to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and my reply thereto, in which I set forth my reasons for supporting Senate bill 866.

There being no objection, the telegram and a letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The press notices in connection with the Fight for Housing Day rally indicate that it is being sponsored by groups some of which are sincerely interested in getting housing but others of which are interested only in

getting public housing. Members of these groups are being told that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill will produce housing, and therefore they should fight for the bill's passage. I sincerely believe that this bill will not produce houses rapidly, but will further stifle construction of housing by private industry. Private industry can and will produce housing if it is permitted to do so. The threat of additional housing is discouraging construction by private industry. I urgently recommend you to properly interpret this activity as a concerted agitation by subsidized housing forces to unnecessarily expend taxpayers' funds on the Federal construction program of public housing. The construction of housing can best be accomplished through the resources of the Nation's privately financed housing industry.

ROBERT M. WILSON,  
President, Philadelphia Real Estate Board.

JULY 10, 1947.

Mr. ROBERT M. WILSON,  
President, Philadelphia Real  
Estate Board, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I acknowledge receipt of your telegram which was actuated by press reports of the Fight for Housing Day Rally, recently held here at Washington and which also expressed your opinion regarding the effect of Senate bill 866 upon a building program by private industry.

Senate bill 866, commonly referred to as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, has been specifically framed to insure private enterprise a full and free opportunity to provide housing for the Nation. It limits Federal aid for public housing to families whose incomes are at least 20 percent below the lowest level at which private enterprise is furnishing a substantial quantity of decent housing, new or used, in any locality.

This not only insulates private home building from any possible competition from publicly aided housing for the low-income groups, it also leaves the way open for private enterprise to provide homes at lower costs than it has ever achieved with the assurance that when, as it does so, the area of public housing will be forced further downward in the income scale limits.

The bill also affords additional aids to private enterprise and enables it to provide housing for lower-income groups through private investment. It broadens and liberalizes financing insurance for private construction to enable private enterprise to meet a larger part of the middle-income group; it furnishes Federal aid to communities to write off the uneconomic cost of blighted areas, so they can be replanned and rebuilt with private enterprise doing the major part of the job; it guarantees a minimum investment yield on large-scale rental housing for middle- and lower-income families; it throws the resources and facilities of the Federal Government behind private industry in housing research directed toward the development of lower cost home production by private enterprise; and it enables the Federal Government to aid and cooperate with private enterprise through consistent and coordinated policies that recognize private enterprise's prime responsibility.

In other words, under S. 266 private enterprise is given opportunities it has never before had to meet that increasing margin of mass need in the middle and low-income brackets that has been beyond its reach.

I am unable to subscribe to the attitude that if private enterprise unaided cannot provide homes for low-income families, then no one should. I firmly believe this attitude will do more to speed Government-sponsored housing than any other course. On the other hand, S. 866, by its clear limitation of the function of public housing, gives private enterprise a clear field to do more of the job, and through performance, to reduce and



even eliminate the need for housing subsidies. Even public housing, under this bill, would be provided through the normal channels of private enterprise, with the capital financing and the construction coming from private sources, and only the subsidies and the management, to insure proper use of the subsidies, being reserved to the Federal and local governments, respectively.

Private enterprise has not and currently cannot provide decent housing for the lower-income groups. Repetition of statements to the contrary does not change the facts. Even with the financing aids of the FHA—which, incidentally, were also bitterly fought at first by many private groups, only to be accepted by nearly all of them later—the cost of housing has not yet been brought within the reach of large numbers of people. In 1940 only 5 percent of FHA home financing was for families with annual incomes of \$1,500 or less, while 7½ percent was for families with incomes of \$2,000 or more. Yet in 1940, nearly one-third of the housing need lay in that income group which had been virtually unserved by private enterprise except in terms of slums.

The situation is much worse now that costs have risen so greatly since 1940. The median cost of homes built in 1946 was \$7,500, yet surveys showed that 85 percent of the veterans in need of housing could afford to pay only \$6,000 or less.

The facts do not support the claim that either public housing or government assistance to private enterprise in housing, where it is needed, hamper private homebuilding. The opposite has been true.

The first public housing was provided in 1936 and continued until the outbreak of war. During that period private enterprise, far from being frightened out of the market, more than doubled its annual production of homes, from 304,000 units in 1936 to 619,000 in 1941, the highest peak since the boom twenties.

During 1946, when some private interests stormed and complained about the emergency measures the Government undertook to help them obtain materials and revive a war-weakened home-building industry, we witnessed a fourfold increase in home building, the greatest in any nation's history. In the face of unprecedented obstacles, we put more than 1,000,000 units under construction, of which more than 650,000 were privately built new permanent homes and apartments.

To call that program a failure, as some do, while at the same time acclaiming the enormous increase in production of building materials and home construction that it made possible, is to make a shambles of elementary logic.

For decades an inadequate system of home building and home finance has left larger and larger quantities of slum and blight for the people to pay for. Property values have been destroyed and countless human values lost. Communities have paid bitterly in crime, disease, fire, and other less tangible costs and have lost tax revenues that have brought some of them virtually to bankruptcy.

S. 866 is designed to stop this disastrous decline of our greatest national asset—the homes of America. It is further designed to enable private enterprise to work better, not to eliminate it, and to substitute a limited and supportable subsidy for housing the low-income groups for the mounting endless toll that we have been paying.

Refusal of some segments of private enterprise to accept the help of Government in the common interest of those who need homes and those who build them can lead only to extreme remedies forced by hopelessness and despair. Those who say they cannot and will not work with the Government in the people's interest destroy the people's faith in their motives. On a problem so acute

and personal as housing is today to millions of American families, neither the Government nor the people can be damned.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

#### STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD four editorials favoring statehood for Hawaii; the first entitled "Hawaii Nears Its Goal," from the Christian Science Monitor; the second entitled "Hawaii, Forty-ninth State," from the Boston Herald; the third entitled "Statehood for Hawaii," from the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican; and the fourth entitled "Case for Hawaii," from the Dallas News; which appear in the Appendix.]

#### BUSINESS RECESSION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "That Recession," published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### INTENTION TO VETO—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Intention to Veto," published in the Washington Post of July 13, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### GRAVY IN THE KITCHEN, TOO—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TIMES

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gravy in the Kitchen, Too," from the Chicago Times of July 11, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### LOCAL AND NATIONAL ELECTIONS IN JAPAN

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 1, 1947, addressed to him and describing local and national elections recently held in Japan, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SUCCESSION BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Succession Bill," published in the Sunday, July 13, 1947, issue of the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### UNITED STATES LARGESSE TOTALS TWENTY BILLION—ARTICLE BY CLARKE BEACH

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Largesse Totals Twenty Billion," by Clarke Beach, from the Washington Post of July 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU TO ISSUE SEWER BONDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1419) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue sewer bonds, which were, on page 1, lines 8 and 9, to strike out "construct, maintain, and repair" and insert "construct", and on page 2, line 10, after the word "Act", to insert "69."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3950) to reduce individual income-tax payments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment to House bill 3950, submitted by the Senator from Arkansas, for himself and other Senators, on which the yeas and nays are requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in keeping with the general understanding and agreement among Senators last Saturday evening, I shall take but little time today to conclude my remarks on the pending amendment. I shall forego any lengthy discussion of it, but do wish to remind Senators that this is the last chance we will have at the present session of Congress to dispose of the issue presented by the amendment, and dispose of it in the right way. This is the second opportunity Senators have had to vote on this amendment at this session. It may be the last opportunity for some of us. I am unwilling to leave the record as it is. I want again to vote on the amendment and record my position so that all husbands and wives in the non-community-property States of the Nation may know that a sincere, diligent, earnest effort was made by the amendment to bring to them relief to which they are justly entitled, at the present session of Congress, at this time, when the last opportunity is afforded Members of Congress to grant them this equitable, just relief.

Mr. President, on Saturday evening I placed in the RECORD a chart which shows how much money each of the non-community-property States is penalized. I call upon my colleagues to turn to page 8812 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If a Senator is from a non-community-property State, I ask him to read the table and weep, and then vote with me his tearful sentiments when the roll is called. I propose to fight for the people of the non-community-property States, and vote for them, and if Senators from such States will join me we will adopt the amendment today, and not leave the situation in a state of promise, an indefinite status for an indefinite time.

Mr. President, there may be some Senators here now who were absent when I discussed the table of figures Saturday evening. I hope every Senator from a non-community-property State will look at the table before he votes, and ask himself, "Can I afford to vote 'nay'? Can I afford to continue to impose this indefensible injustice upon the people of my State?"

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he considers his amendment fair and just to all the people of the United States? And I ask the further question, Does the Senator de-

sire to do anything more than what is fair and just by offering his amendment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the amendment is fair and just to everyone. I have no desire to do other than what is just and fair. Already a number of Senators from community-property States have joined with us in the fight because they believe justice should be done. It is a nonpartisan matter. It simply represents American justice and integrity in legislation. Of course, the primary, the major responsibility rests upon the Republican Party, because it is in control of Congress and has the power and the opportunity to adopt the amendment. It is, however, nonpartisan in nature.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Has anyone who opposes the Senator's amendment been able successfully to show any respect in which the amendment would not be fair and just to all the people of the United States?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No such showing has been made on the floor of the Senate. If any such showing has been made, it has been made somewhere else than in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. President, the Republican Party has the major responsibility, but Senators of that party are not the only ones who have a responsibility. A majority of the membership of the Senate comes from non-community-property States and they collectively also have the power to adopt the amendment. That is not all, Mr. President. We have got to accept individual responsibility to our constituents. I plead with Senators from non-community-property States to vote right on the amendment. In the campaign next year Senators are going to be asked by the husbands and wives in their States why they did not take advantage of this opportunity to give them the relief to which they are entitled. The question is going to be an embarrassing one. It would be for me. I could not answer it. I could not provide an alibi for failing to vote right. If we vote right today the embarrassing question will not be asked. The answer will have been given by Senators today if they vote right. Senators who vote for the amendment will have done all they can; they will have met their responsibility; their obligation will have been discharged. In order properly to discharge our obligation we should vote for the amendment, vote to make it a provision of the bill, and finally to be enacted into law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume the Senator from Arkansas has called the attention of the Senate and the country to the provision of the Constitution which requires that the Congress shall cause duties and imposts and excise taxes and taxes generally to be uniform throughout the United States. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to read one paragraph of section 8 of article I of the Constitution into the RECORD at this time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The very first article of the Constitution, in section 8, provides:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Of course, what the Senator from Arkansas is trying to correct is the method of laying and collecting taxes in those respects in which they are not uniform. The Senator is attempting to make them uniform in accordance with the highest authority, the authority which gives us the power to tax.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct. I am undertaking, in accordance with the provision of the Constitution, to rectify an injustice which has grown up in our tax system.

Mr. President, I wish to say something else to my friends across the aisle. In different debates during the past year we have heard the charge that there are some who are yes-men. I have never been a yes-man. I vote with my party when I can. I often yield my own judgment out of deference to the leadership of my party, but there are times when I think the position of the leadership of my party contravenes principle, and then I cross the aisle and join with Senators on the other side in voting as I believe to be fundamentally correct. I make no promise that I shall not do so again. I shall. I ask Senators who are members of the majority party, and who have power to adopt the amendment, not to be hide-bound respecting any proposal which the majority leadership demands to be carried through here at the unjust expense of and as an imposition upon their own people. That is the way to get good legislation. Let the Congress legislate. Let it weigh the pros and cons, and then have the courage, when the opportunity is presented, to vote its sincere convictions.

Mr. President, the die may be cast. This may be a losing fight at this hour, but it will not always be a losing fight. Like truth crushed to earth, this issue will rise again and again until some future Congress—if this one does not—responds to the just demands and expectations of the people of the Nation. The die may be cast to defeat this amendment; but the die is also cast in the hearts and minds of the people and in the public sentiment of the Nation to demand and secure the rectification of this wrong. I plead with Senators to join me today and do it now. It can be done. It ought to be done.

Mr. President, I want the Senate to know that the country is thinking about this question. I have before me a number of editorials which I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The first is from the Minneapolis Star of July 3, 1947, and is entitled "Pass the Tax Bill." This is the concluding paragraph of the editorial:

So the tax bill should go through Congress now—with a correction of the community-property discrimination if that is at all possible.

The people favor it, Mr. President, and no one can say that it is impossible. It may be considered impossible because of an arbitrary decision on the part of those who are making the legislative policies of this country at this hour. That is the only reason it is impossible. There is no other excuse.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Minneapolis Star printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PASS THE TAX BILL

Passage of the tax-reduction bill to take effect January 1, 1948, is being endangered by the efforts of some Democrats to attach a community-property amendment to the bill. Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, has said that he and at least three other Democratic Senators will refuse to go along with any reduction bill that does not carry authority for husbands and wives to divide their income for tax purposes.

Still other Senators have expressed doubts about the proposed amendment, though why they should is difficult to understand.

By everyone's admission, including the Treasury Department, there is a present unfair discrimination in favor of nearly a dozen States with community-property laws. In them husbands and wives may divide their incomes when calculating income taxes, even though the husband may be the only one getting a pay check. Thus, they take advantage of lower tax rates in the lower income brackets.

If those privileges were extended to the other 37 States, an estimated 4,900,000 families would benefit. This is especially true of the \$2,000 to \$4,000 earning class, where some 3,700,000 families would be aided.

Treasury Secretary Snyder recently presented such a plan to a House committee as a possible way to eliminate one bad form of tax discrimination. It would reduce Treasury revenues by only \$744,000,000 annually, a relatively small price for remedying a gross inequity.

If Congress doesn't pass a tax-reduction law effective next January before it adjourns this session, it will postpone the problem until next January, an election year, when it will be under supreme pressure to make appropriations for large-scale expenditures. Only if it lowers taxes now will it have the courage to remain adamant to the many election-year demands for increased spending.

So the tax bill should go through Congress now—with a correction of the community-property discrimination if that is at all possible.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 10, 1947, entitled "The Community Property Favoritism." I note that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is present. I want him to know that the husbands and wives of the State of Missouri expect this injustice to be corrected. I trust that it will be corrected, and I trust that I may have the Senator's help at this hour, when the opportunity is present. This editorial says:

No one knows whether Congress will keep the Ways and Means Committee's promise, or when. Meanwhile, each new State in the community property list heightens the discrimination against residents of hold-out States.



Mr. President, as I have said before on this floor, this system is a form of Federal coercion. It is our constitutional duty to legislate uniformly in the matter of raising taxes. I hope the Senators from Missouri realize what the present system is now costing the people of their State, and how much they are penalized. The penalty amounts to \$23,205,000 a year. That is worth doing something about. There can be no justification for postponing the day of judgment. Today is the day of judgment. Why postpone it until tomorrow? Why postpone until tomorrow what we can do and ought to do today?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE COMMUNITY-PROPERTY FAVORITISM

The second tax-cut bill may fail because it does not end the favoritism to community-property States. The House Ways and Means Committee promised to make the correction in a bill to be written next year. But in the Senate, Senator McCLELLAN and others insist on immediate action.

In community-property States, the incomes of a husband and a wife are regarded as jointly and equally owned. A family in which the husband has \$5,000, and the wife has nothing, pays \$38 less tax than a similar couple in a non-community-property State. It pays taxes on two \$2,500 incomes, qualifying for lower rates than are levied on a single \$5,000 income. The privilege increases in value with the size of the incomes.

Such discrimination among Federal taxpayers is unjust, and repeated efforts have been made in Congress to abolish it. But the community-property States hold a balance of power. Attention has, therefore, turned to ending the inequality by making the tax-saving privilege available everywhere.

In the continued absence of relief from Congress, additional States lose patience and pass their own community-property laws. Only nine had them a few months ago; now there are 13. Pennsylvania has just joined, because, as Governor Duff put it, the resulting \$100,000,000 annual saving to married Pennsylvanians cannot possibly be overlooked.

No one knows whether Congress will keep the Ways and Means Committee's promise, or when. Meanwhile, each new State in the community-property list heightens the discrimination against residents of hold-out States. Our legislature should thus make this matter a first order of business after the recess.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from the Atlanta Constitution of May 29, 1947, entitled "No Sense in Procrastination." That is the way the press and the people of the country are looking at this issue. I shall not take the time to read the entire editorial. Its concluding paragraph says, with respect to the promise of the Ways and Means Committee:

That means another year of the unfair burden. There is no sense in procrastination. If we are going to reduce taxes, let us adopt equity first and remove the injustice and discrimination under which the people of 38 States so long have suffered.

That is a quotation from my remarks when this issue was under consideration

before. My remarks are quoted approvingly by this great newspaper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Atlanta Constitution printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NO SENSE IN PROCRASTINATION

It is to be regretted that the Senate has voted to reject the proposal to eliminate the discrimination which now exists because of the so-called community-property laws of 10 of the 48 States.

It means that for at least another year residents of Arizona, California, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, and Washington will continue to be accorded special tax-exemption privileges denied citizens of other States.

Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, sought to amend the income-tax bill to extend the community-property-tax system throughout the country, so that the 38 States which currently do not have it would not be forced to bear a disproportionate share of the tax load. Under that system, husbands and wives are allowed to split their incomes for tax purposes, thus effectuating a considerable family saving.

McCLELLAN's amendment was rejected by a vote of 51 to 29—13 Democrats joining with 38 Republicans to kill it.

Republican spokesmen, while giving lip service to the idea of a community-property-tax set-up, contend that now is not the time to inaugurate it.

For our part, we are more inclined to agree with Senator McCLELLAN, who, answering a GOP promise that the plan would be put at the top of the tax-revision agenda next year, declared:

"That means another year of the unfair burden. There is no sense in procrastination. If we are going to reduce taxes, let us adopt equity first and remove the injustice and discrimination under which the people of 38 States so long have suffered."

Mr. McCLELLAN. The next editorial is from the Nashville Tennessean of May 29, 1947, and is entitled "Saving the Top Dressing." I shall not take the time to read it, but it states the position which I am taking. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SAVING THE TOP DRESSING

Rejection by the Senate of Senator McCLELLAN's amendment to raise personal exemptions on the income tax to \$750 was not unexpected. The amendment was out of harmony with the main objective of the bill, which is "relief for the greedy" instead of the needy. But why turn down the community-property-law amendment, also presented by the Arkansas legislator?

The merits of the community-property-law proposal are indisputable. It would merely put income-tax payers in all brackets in 38 States on a basis of equality with those in 10 States which by virtue of having once been Spanish territory can lay claim to the Roman-law principle on property holding.

In rejecting the amendment, the Republicans promised to put it high on the list for next year, when general tax reform is promised. Interpreted in plain English, this means that the party of big wealth plans to decorate its plan to eliminate corporation and high income taxes with an obviously

good and just measure. Hence, they are putting this top-dressing justice (and maybe the exemption increases, too) into the ice box for safekeeping until the 1948 tax cake is pulled out of the oven.

In casting aside Mr. McCLELLAN's amendment to raise exemptions, the Republican majority rejected the one means of sustaining mass purchasing power without releasing inflationary pressures. We are even now in a recession, with unemployment figures approaching 3,000,000, mainly because the power to buy consumer goods is drying up at the lower income levels. The Bureau of Labor Statistics index indicates that approximately \$2,200 a year is needed to maintain a family of four at the minimum level of health and decency. Income-tax relief at the bottom, through the simple expedient of raising exemptions, would enable more families to maintain a minimum standard of living and brighten existence with moderate buying of such additional goods as would keep our economy going at a high level.

Relief at the top is not needed. Leading business magazines report that all businesses of any size are having no trouble getting all the capital needed or desired for operation or expansion. Reduction of taxes on high incomes now will merely increase savings, not capital investments.

In working against sound tax measures, the Republicans are lessening their chances to win the national leadership. There would be little to worry about if that were the only result. Unhappily, their current tax reforms, if they manage to get by the White House, can make trouble for most of the Nation also.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The next editorial is from the Arkansas Democrat of July 1, 1947, and is entitled "Community-Property Law." I shall not take the time to read it. The people of my State realize the penalty they are suffering. They know that they must look to the Congress for aid. They know that our fight is in the interest of justice, uniformity, and proper government relationship between the citizens of all States, irrespective of State law or domicile.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Arkansas Democrat be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### COMMUNITY-PROPERTY LAW

Arkansas' Senator McCLELLAN may be tackling a job that is too tough for him in fighting for a Federal community-property law, but he should have the support of all fair-minded people.

We are told that a coalition to revive the vetoed tax-reduction bill has been set back by Senator McCLELLAN's announcement that he and others will insist on a community-property amendment.

We are told that a move to attach the clause in the Senate apparently would defeat any plan for quick passage by both Houses of the measure reducing individual taxes \$4,000,000,000. Supporters propose to revive the measure to make it effective next January 1 instead of July 1, as was provided in the vetoed tax bill.

Whether Senator McCLELLAN's proposal would block passage of a new measure still is anybody's guess, apparently. But it would be a strange quirk of even so strange a Congress as the current session if this plain demand for common decency in taxation should upset the apple cart.

Isn't it about time that Congress pay some attention to the theory that our Government is based upon the belief that a majority

should rule? Haven't we had enough of shake-downs by potent minorities, as witness the silver bloc and several others we might mention?

Isn't it a joke, in fact, a travesty, that because of State laws 10 States can legally dodge taxes which 38 others have to pay? The community-property laws have been upheld by the courts, but that does no more than put the seal of approval upon a rank injustice, a prize example of discrimination.

There's another angle to the argument. The 10 States which have community-property laws have persistently fought all efforts to extend such rights to other States. Nobody else is going to share the gravy, is their attitude. Good neighborliness is fine—so long as it doesn't hit the pocketbook.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the able Senator from Arkansas considered what would be the state of the United States Senate if we were to pass a tax bill dealing with excise and similar taxes, and providing that such taxes should be levied on rubber tires, automobiles, amusements, and so forth, except in the States A, B, C, D, E, F, and G, for example?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is exactly what we are doing now, in effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the difference in principle, so far as the National Government is concerned, between exempting the citizens of certain States from the payment of excise taxes and exempting the citizens of certain States from the full payment of their just share of income taxes?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Fundamentally they are the same. I am pleading for a principle. I am not pleading for something for the citizens of my State alone. I am pleading for a principle, on behalf of millions of American husbands and wives.

The next editorial is from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of May 29, 1947, and is entitled "Not a Lost Cause." This editorial was published immediately after the vote on this amendment when the tax bill was previously before us. The people know that it is not a lost cause. They know that public sentiment is going to demand that action be taken. If this Congress will not take it, some day a Congress will be elected which will correct the situation. The people will see to that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal be printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### NOT A LOST CAUSE

The Senate refused an amendment offered by Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, to the tax-reduction bill, that would have extended the benefits of the community-property principle to the people of all the States. Senator McCLELLAN made a good fight in a worthy cause, which is by no manner of means a lost one.

The Senate's rejection of Senator McCLELLAN's proposal was based on a feeling that it was not wise to complicate further the pending measure, and not on any widespread feeling that his ideas lacked justice and usefulness. Chairman MILLIKIN, of the Senate

Finance Committee, though he led the fight against the amendment, said the proposition had top rating among matters to be considered in a general tax-revision bill.

Senator McCLELLAN may be depended on to continue his campaign for tax equality, and if the people of some 39 States wake up to what he has in hand, his drive will soon be successful. There are 9 States of the 48 that operate under the community-property law. In these 9 States the theory is that husband and wife make equal contributions to family income. On that basis, the family income may be divided for income tax purposes, with the husband and wife each reporting a half. The benefits are considerable in any case, an increase with the amount of taxable income.

The community-property principle was incorporated in the basic law of most of the States that have it, but one or more have taken action to apply the idea. As matters now stand, the authorities on laws and taxes believe action by Congress is necessary if the principle is extended. Married people ought to concern themselves especially with seeing that equality is established, and in general no such state of unbalance should be permitted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, these editorials come not alone from the press of the South. Here is one from the Boston Herald, of Boston, Mass., entitled "Speed Tax Splitting." I wonder if the Senators from Massachusetts are cognizant of the penalty which is imposed on the people of their State? Let us see what it is. The penalty is \$42,500,000. Should not that be of interest to them? Are they not willing to help correct the situation?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Boston Herald printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### SPEED TAX SPLITTING

The inequity between community-property States and the rest of the country, including Massachusetts, is growing. When the Herald last deplored this disparity, nine States provided by law for the sharing of income by husband and wife. In these States married persons with \$3,000 or over paid substantially less Federal tax because their taxable income could be split. Now there are 10 such States, Oregon having just joined the bargain group. In addition, the tax-reduction bill now being considered by the Senate happens unintentionally to increase the special privilege enjoyed by the 10 States.

The inclination in Congress appears to be to let this income-splitting business alone for the present year and take it up in connection with next year's general revision of the revenue law, on which the House Ways and Means Committee has already begun work. One argument is that the House has already passed a bill and not much time remains to rewrite it in the Senate and in conference. Another is that to permit income splitting for husbands and wives affords no comfort for the unmarried—say for a widower with one child. And still a third is that the big gainers would be the upper-bracket boys, for the helping of whom there is no political profit.

But these arguments can all be upset, seriatim.

Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas (a non-community-property State contiguous to three that are), has perfected a draft amendment which provides a simple tax reduction for everyone, coupled with income splitting, the whole thing to cost no more in revenue than the present bill, H. R. 1. He would raise personal exemptions to \$750

for single persons and \$1,500 for the head of a family. That would remove between eight and nine million persons from the tax rolls, lower the taxes in all other brackets, and cost about \$3,000,000,000 in revenue. The income-splitting provision would cost another \$800,000,000. This is also the cost of H. R. 1. The saving in each surtax group is almost the same under the two bills.

It will be noted that the widower with one child gets a break under this bill because of the increased exemption. It may not always be as great as what would be enjoyed by the married man in the same bracket, but this inequity is far less than maintaining the present 10-State disparity.

And the contention that the wealthy would be great gainers is ill-founded. A married man in the high surtax brackets, with competent legal advice, can find a loophole, and usually does. It is the salaried married man that mostly gets hit.

Here is a way to settle the community-property absurdity this year. By acting now, Congress will have gained 6 months or a year's experience of the actual revenue effects of such a change and be in a much better position to judge the situation when undertaking an over-all revision of the tax laws next year. The time to act is now. Massachusetts would like to hear its Senators speak up on this one.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, these are only a few editorials of many.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If we should not be able to adopt the Senator's amendment, would the Senator vote for an amendment providing that all the people of the United States should pay income tax on the basis of not being able to split the family income under the community property law?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No. I believe it would be wrong for us to take such action. I will defend the rights of the community property States here or elsewhere. I do not want to do them any harm. I am pleading with those in community property States to help us rectify this wrong now. I respect the State laws. I do not want to say to the people of any State that they cannot divide their property as they wish under State law. But I will not sit here and see my State imposed upon and the laws of my State ignored by the same Government which recognizes the State laws of community property States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Do I correctly gather from the Senator's remarks that he does not want to make any State change its present laws which it has on the statute books, but that he does want equal taxation so far as the Federal Government is concerned?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is all I am pleading for.

Mr. President, I conclude. I have made the fight sincerely. I have pleaded with my colleagues from every State to join me in doing this act of simple justice and to help me prevent a prolongation of this discrimination. Let us assure the husbands and wives in the other 35 States of the Nation that this Congress is equal to the issue of the hour and that it will meet it honorably, with integrity, and with positive action today, not tomorrow. Why delay? Today is the day of salvation for our people. This is the



hour of opportunity. Let us strike now while we know we have the power and the votes. Let us correct the situation now.

I am ready for a vote at any time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], which has been offered on behalf of himself and several other Senators.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has just concluded a most earnest, strong, and sincere appeal for the correction of what he conceives to be an injustice in our tax laws. He has called upon the majority party in charge of the pending bill to correct that injustice and to write into the tax measure the amendment for which he has so earnestly pleaded. I am sure the majority party needs no assistance from me; but in the light of the manner in which the amendment has been suggested and the appeal which has been made, and coming, as I do, from a community-property State, I think I should state briefly some of the other considerations which are involved in this amendment.

I know full well, Mr. President, that neither the Senator from Arkansas nor any of the other Senators who have joined in this amendment desires to create any other discrimination whatsoever; and the Senator from Arkansas a moment ago, in reply to a question by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON] exhibited a very fine attitude when it was suggested, possibly as a threat to us who come from community-property States, that if the Senate could not agree to this amendment, then another amendment would be agreed to or a law passed which would take away from us the rights and privileges granted by the laws of our various States. The Senator from Arkansas very frankly said that he would oppose any such legislation as that. I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Arkansas in that regard.

It is not my purpose at all to argue at this time the merits of this particular amendment, but I do want to suggest to the majority party that there is much more involved than merely agreeing to an amendment which would authorize husbands and wives to divide their incomes, regardless of the ownership of such incomes. That, after all, is exactly the proposition which is submitted here. I want to make it very distinct and very clear that there is no question of constitutionality involved. There is no question of uniformity of taxation under the Federal laws. The Federal laws are now uniform, and they have been uniform throughout the years. The levy of taxes in the State of New Mexico is exactly on the same principle which obtains in the State of Colorado or in the State of Arkansas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator may be technically correct, so far as the law is concerned, but the Senator knows that the application of the law in

the State of New Mexico is very different from its application in the State of Colorado. The Senator knows that to be so.

Mr. HATCH. I do not agree to that statement at all. I do not think the application of the law is any different.

The historic and basic principle of all taxation is ownership of property or ownership of income. That is the way it should be. That is the law at this time. It happens, however, that in the community-property States the income which husband and wife acquire by their joint efforts during marriage is owned equally by the husband and wife. It is not a fictitious ownership; it is an absolute ownership. Therefore the Federal Government applies a rule of taxation which is just the same in my State as it is in non-community-property States—that of ownership of income.

The amendment would change the historic and basic principle of ownership of income and would establish for the first time in the history of the country a new rule and principle for the levying of taxes. The rule which it lays down is not ownership of income at all. It does not make any difference as to the source from which it comes. Husband and wife can arbitrarily divide the income for the purposes of taxation. That is not all. It will create still further discriminations than those which now exist. To show the Senate something else which would happen, in my State the income which the husband acquires from his separate estate and property is his separate income. The income of the wife is her separate income. They account for it separately under the community-property law. Each pays a tax because each owns the income. Under this amendment that would be wiped out. They could lump their individual separate incomes in one pot, if I may use the expression, and divide it for income-tax purposes. That is only one of the effects which the adoption of this amendment would have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is, of course, familiar with what is happening in many of the States which were not originally community-property States but which are now adopting such laws, such as Michigan, New York, and other States. In order to save their citizens from discrimination in the collection of taxes as between their States and community-property States, they are enacting laws covering the situation. Does the Senator think that Congress is justified in compelling those States, in order to avoid discrimination, to pass laws themselves on the subject, which may create controversial questions which do not exist in other States, and which would require legal decisions and even Supreme Court decisions? Does the Senator think that is the way for Congress to act in this matter?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator I will say that the Congress is not compelling any State to pass any law whatever. The ownership

of property within a State is a matter for determination by the State itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will yield further, the people of Colorado are being penalized to the extent of more than \$7,000,000 a year. If that is not compulsion, I do not know what is compulsion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to read the Senator a paragraph from an article on community property issued by the Legislative Reference Service. I call my colleagues' attention to the fact that is one point that seems to be overlooked by some of those who come from the non-community-property States. They keep talking about the tax advantages, and so forth, accruing to the residents of the community-property States, but they completely lose sight of the fact that certain liabilities or disadvantages go with the community-property system. I quote from this memorandum:

Balanced against this advantage are the following liabilities which the system entails for the husband. Should his marriage end in divorce, a distribution and division of the marital gains becomes necessary in a manner akin to the dissolution of a business partnership. If his wife predeceases him, he may likewise be compelled to liquidate his business assets in order to satisfy the claims of his wife's heirs and beneficiaries; and such liquidation may ruin him financially.

As I pointed out on the floor the other day, in my State of California, which is a community-property State, a husband and wife are considered partners, and that is a part of the system that was handed down to us from the Mexican law. The husband and wife are considered partners during their marriage, and the wife is considered as doing her job in the home and the husband as doing his job. But under the community-property principle, both of them are considered as contributing to the family partnership; and during the period of years, the earnings are jointly owned by the two partners to the marriage partnership. In the State of California, assuming that the husband and wife during their married life have accumulated an estate of \$25,000 or \$50,000 or \$100,000. If the wife dies first she can will her community interest to anyone to whom she desires to leave it, or she can dispose of her property as she sees fit to dispose of it.

As the Senator will undoubtedly bring out during the course of his remarks, in 1942 there was enacted legislation which distinctly discriminates against the community-property States in the matter of inheritance taxes.

Mr. HATCH. As a matter of fact, in that situation the wife pays an inheritance tax upon property which is hers, and which she does not inherit.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator have an amendment to correct that

situation, which he is prepared to offer if my amendment is adopted?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have an amendment which I intend to offer, but only in the event the Senator's amendment is adopted, because I believe that this tax situation has so many ramifications that it should be considered in all its aspects. We have the assurance of the able chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate and also the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House that they recognize the existence of some of these problems which have been so ably brought out by the Senator from Arkansas and others. We have their assurance that that matter will be taken up under the general tax revision legislation next year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope my amendment will be adopted, and I hope the Senator from California will offer his amendment. I should like to have him correct the situation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am entirely sympathetic with the attitude of the Senator from Arkansas relative to the problem he is trying to meet. However, I wish to point out another phase of the matter which has not been discussed, namely, what will happen, if this amendment is adopted, which does not now happen.

Suppose, for instance, in a community-property State there are a husband and wife who have recently married. Let us say that before the marriage the wife had an income of a million dollars, a year, as her separate property. Under existing laws, in a community-property State she pays taxes on that whole million dollars. But under this amendment that amount could arbitrarily be divided between the husband and wife, for taxation purposes, and the Government would lose that much money. That is one of the matters to which I am inviting attention.

The inheritance-tax law, which the Senator from California has already mentioned, is another law which discriminates against the community-property States. There are other burdens not related to taxation which attach to the community-property States and from which, if this amendment were adopted, all husbands and wives in non-community-property States would escape and be free. They would have all the benefits and all the advantages, and none of the corresponding burdens.

As I say, I am interested in the problem which confronts the non-community-property States, but I shall urge that this amendment be rejected now. I shall urge that the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House consider all these problems, as they have promised to do, and submit to the Congress a bill which will be fair to the non-community-property States and fair to the community-property States. When that is done I shall be glad to support such a measure. I shall be sympathetic toward the claims of the non-community-property States, but I do not think this amendment touches the question; and I do know that

if it alone is adopted and made a part of the law, in trying to relieve against discriminations in the non-community-property States, other discriminations will be raised against the community-property States, and I do not believe the Senate wishes to do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas for himself and other Senators.

#### AMENDMENT OF LABOR-RELATIONS LAW

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, because I have been asked several questions, I shall digress for a moment, and shall discuss another subject. When the Taft-Hartley bill was before the Senate, I thought all of us knew it was not a perfect bill. The question of labor-management relations is too great, too involved, and too complex to be solved by one or even a series of legislative acts, if it is possible to solve those problems by legislation at all.

Nevertheless, many of us believed that notwithstanding those apparent defects, the Taft-Hartley bill contained much worth-while legislation, sufficient to require its passage. Even when the conference report was discussed on the floor and when one of the more objectionable features was plainly pointed out, the thought continued with some of us that corrections could be made by subsequent legislation and that it would be better to pass that measure and let it become the law, notwithstanding the defects. I myself was of that mind, but I made it plain that whenever an injustice or wrong appeared I would sponsor legislation to correct it.

Accordingly, last week I was glad to join with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] in submitting to the Taft-Hartley law an amendment which we believe will correct at least one wrong and error which was contained in the original act. The amendment we offer merely strikes out the word "expenditures" from what was first section 304 of the House bill, and was later incorporated into the legislation finally drawn up by the conferees representing the two houses. The bill which passed the Senate did not contain that provision. So far as the Senate is concerned, that provision appeared in the Senate only when the conference report was submitted to it.

By including the word "expenditures," it was sought to place expenditures on the same basis as contributions, and to apply both of those terms to both corporations and labor organizations. At first glance, that provision would seem to be a fair one; it would seem to be fair to place corporations and labor organizations upon the same basis. However, it is this provision including the word "expenditures" which caused considerable debate in the Senate, and it was claimed that the provision violates certain constitutional guaranties of freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

As I have said, there was some discussion of this provision at the time when the conference report was being considered, but it must be remembered

that in the consideration of a conference report no opportunity for vote on separate provisions is given and the only vote possible is to either adopt or reject the conference report. Therefore, Senators never had an opportunity to express themselves on the inclusion of the word "expenditures" in the general restrictions against political contributions.

The amendment the Senator from Vermont and I have offered will give an opportunity to vote on the exact question and the precise issue. This is one of my reasons in offering the amendment. If at all possible, it should be reported by the committee and discussed and acted upon before the present session adjourns.

I am not discussing the constitutional aspect of the situation. Regardless of that, it appeared to me at the time the conference report was being discussed that including the word "expenditures" did unfairly discriminate against labor organizations. It was a defect, however, which I believed could be corrected by later legislation, and, therefore, I am glad to sponsor an amendment which will give the opportunity to make what I concede to be a needed correction.

At this time I shall not argue the proposition as to why including the word "expenditures" does unfairly discriminate against labor organizations, but inasmuch as I have said that at first glance it appears it would be fair to place labor organizations upon the same basis as corporations, it should be pointed out that prohibiting corporations from making expenditures is not quite the same as prohibiting expenditures by labor organizations. There is not an exact equality as between corporations generally and labor organizations. If it is desired to be fair and to place those who labor and their organizations upon an exact basis of equality, a broader term than "corporations" should be included. My own past investigations of political activities, especially as relates to contributions and also to expenditures, cause me to believe—I might use a much stronger word and say "to know"—that many of the excessive campaign contributions and expenditures are made by individuals. In fact, most of them are; they are not made by corporations. Yet those individuals derive much of their wealth, much of their ability to make contributions and expenditures, from the ownership of stock in corporations, and some of the individuals who make huge contributions are even large employers on their own account, but they are not affected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator realizes that very frequently contributions are made by corporations indirectly, in that officers of the corporation, being given very liberal expense accounts, are able to make the contributions out of the expense accounts, but, like the hidden



"raincoat" expense, they do not show in the expense account.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator for his contribution. As a matter of fact, I not only agree with what he has said, but I think it can be demonstrated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senator ever examine the expense accounts of labor leaders reported by the labor unions? In many cases they are a good deal larger than those of the corporation executives.

Mr. HATCH. I have not examined the expense accounts of labor leaders.

Mr. MORSE. I think an investigation will show one marked difference; there will not be any hidden "raincoats" in the expense accounts of the average labor leader; the expense accounts will show what the money was spent for. The labor leader in most well-run unions has to have his expense account approved by a floor vote of the union at the next convention. That check does not exist in the case of the business executive who makes hidden political campaign donations out of expense accounts.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, all this should conclusively prove my thought about the amendment. The provision to which I refer never should have been included in the bill. It is a matter about which there is much dispute, and much argument can be made on both sides. It is a measure relating to political activities, and it does not relate to the affairs of management and labor whatsoever. It should never have been considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It should have gone in the first instance to the committee which properly considers the problems of political contributions and political activities.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that leaders of labor organizations throughout the country are paying no attention to this provision of the Taft-Hartley Act. In fact, they are advising their followers to openly violate it.

Mr. HATCH. I shall discuss that subject in a moment. I point out that when we consider contributions by the laboring man, the individual worker himself does not have the means, the money, to make excessive campaign contributions.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator discussed, in his able argument, whether or not he believes this particular phase of the Taft-Hartley law as passed is constitutional?

Mr. HATCH. I am coming to that in a moment.

With some reason, it is rather strenuously argued in various circles that to deny the labor organizations the right to make campaign expenditures does, in actual effect, deny the laboring people the means and weapons so effectively used in campaigns by the employer, acting individually or through other legitimate sources. On the other hand, it is argued that this prohibition is for the

protection of the laboring man, himself, to safeguard the individual union member against misuse of funds for political purposes, to which he, the individual member, would not subscribe.

Whatever may be the correct view, the contentions raised on both sides are so serious, they ought to be fully examined and explored by appropriate committees of the Congress, and a fair determination of the matter made in a bill which has had full consideration by the proper committee upon the exact issue. Such a provision should never have been included in a bill relating to labor-management relations.

I have not discussed the constitutional features of the question—and I see the Senator from Illinois has been compelled to leave the Chamber—but the contention has been made that this particular provision is a violation of the constitutional guaranty of free speech and of a free press. Whether that is true or not is a question which certainly should be explored and determined by the Congress before it is made the permanent law of the land.

It has been my opinion, long adhered to, that Congress should never enact legislation which even approaches a violation of free speech or of the freedom of the press. These freedoms are so essential, there should never be any question as to whether they have been violated. If any doubt arises in any measure pending before the Congress, that doubt should be resolved against the proposal and in favor of complete freedom of press and freedom of speech.

The Senator from Illinois stated just now that certain labor leaders are planning a deliberate violation of this particular provision of the Taft-Hartley law in order that a test in the courts can be made. I think it is wrong for the Congress to enact legislation which would invite a test in the courts of these freedoms.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is entirely possible that the labor leaders may be inviting a test which they feel they are almost certain to win, because there is not the slightest shadow of a doubt that this rider on the labor bill, which was adopted in the conference committee, is a direct violation of the right of free speech and the right of a free press.

I wish to join the Senator from New Mexico at this time in urging that action be taken to correct, at the earliest possible date, this bit of foolish legislation on the part of Congress. I understand that if interpreted literally, as a law should be interpreted, most of the newspapers of the country would be violating the law if they commented on political issues during political campaigns. Certainly there are many organizations, some on one side of an issue and some on another, which are incorporated, which would be strictly prohibited from spending a single penny to distribute voting records of Members of Congress, or even commenting on issues in a political campaign.

This rider on the labor bill is, in my opinion, about the most foolish bit of legislation which has been accepted and adopted by the Congress at this session. It simply cannot work. It will force those who now take part in political campaigns openly to work through subterfuges, to change their methods, to do in an underhanded way what up to now they have been able to do openly. I think it is the duty of the Congress to correct at the earliest possible date this gross violation of the constitutional rights of the American people.

Certainly, as the Senator from New Mexico has said, everyone has the right to express himself freely as to candidates or issues entering into our political campaigns. I think Senators have a duty that should be discharged without delay.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay the Senate; but I wanted to bring this question to the attention of Senators and to urge immediate action. It is argued that there is no necessity for considering it now, because the law relates only to Federal elections, and therefore action may well be deferred until the next session. There is always the possibility of a special congressional election. I think one is approaching soon in the State of Maryland, and the law, if constitutional, is applicable in that instance. But even supposing there were no special elections, why not repeal the provision now? No harm could be done by repealing it. No harm could be done by removing the doubt which exists today in the minds of so many people. If there be a doubt as to whether the freedom of the press or the freedom of speech is being infringed, the matter is one that should cause immediate concern. I am not arguing that the provision is constitutional or unconstitutional. The only thing I am asking is that the appropriate congressional committee take the amendment, report it to the Senate, and let Senators express themselves by their votes on the precise question. I urge the committee to take that action.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from New Mexico that I wish to commend him for the position which he has taken on the Taft-Hartley bill, and in regard to this particular amendment.

Mr. HATCH. I am sure the Senator restricts his commendation to what I have said on this particular amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I am about to do that by this sentence. I think it is commendable of the Senator. I am glad to hear him and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] support the amendment, because the points the Senator is now making were all made before a vote was taken on the bill. I think it would be much more beneficial if the Senator from New Mexico would join with us who have already offered a bill to repeal the entire act.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in reply to what the Senator from Oregon has said, I made it clear in the beginning that at the time this particular question was discussed I was greatly disturbed about it. I decided that the best procedure would be to pass the bill and

later correct its defects. I am still of that opinion. I am still of the opinion I entertained when I voted for the Taft-Hartley bill. I am not receding from or changing my position, but I do think this is a matter which ought to be corrected.

#### ALLOCATION OF TAXES BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in his discussion of the pending tax bill the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] suggested a study of an allocation of taxes between the Federal and State levels of government.

The overlapping and duplication of government in the United States is not only confusing to the citizen but extremely costly.

Upon request of the governors' conference a committee of three from the Ways and Means Committee and a committee of three from the Senate Finance Committee were appointed to confer with a committee of six governors to plan allocation of sources of revenue to the States and the Federal Government.

That meeting was to have been held this afternoon in Salt Lake City, but owing to the importance of the legislation now pending it was, of course, improper for the Members of Congress to leave their duties here. I was honored by being appointed from the Finance Committee.

I feel that the simplification of our government procedures is one of the paramount duties of the three levels of government at the present time. With that in mind I prepared a statement setting forth some of my thoughts on this subject to be presented at the conference in Salt Lake City this afternoon. Without taking the time of the Senate to read it I now ask unanimous consent to have this statement here inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In seeking to analyze the tug-of-war for position, power and authority between Washington and the several States, the man who has served both as governor and as United States Senator is in a particularly advantageous position.

I have been fortunate enough to have had a place on both sides of that contest. This advantage has brought me a greater tolerance and a better understanding of why Congress frequently reaches out and arrogates to itself control of functions which have belonged to the States for a century and a half.

But it has likewise brought confirmation of the position I held so strongly when I served my State as governor—that when the Founding Fathers limited the powers of the Federal Government to those specifically delegated to it by the Constitution, they wisely omitted any provision under which the National Government could take away those rights reserved to the States or to the people.

On the contrary, the States were then, and are now, the keystone in our arch of freedom. They are the strong wall of defense set up against the centralization of power in a total national government.

In recent years, there have been cracks in that defense. A great bureaucracy has been undermining the wall and threatening its destruction. The present Congress is patching the structure, but it needs help

from the States and their governors to do more than a jerry-built job.

Let us now consider briefly why this help is needed and let me point out one of the reasons why Congress is reluctant to surrender some of the powers which have come under control of the Federal Government.

On the one hand, the States and their local subdivisions demand a return of portions of their sovereignty which have been wrested from them in recent years. On the other hand, these same States and local subdivisions exert pressure upon the Government for continued and increasing fiscal aid.

Every department of the Federal Government is now larger than it was before the war, and still the demand comes from individuals and from States and their subdivisions for the continuance of all the services they have enjoyed, and that some new ones be instituted. In 14 years, \$43,000,000,000 of subsidies and grants have been made to States, local governments, corporations, and individuals.

Washington is now spending at the rate of almost \$40,000,000,000 per year. In the last prewar year it was less than \$9,000,000,000. In 1930, it was less than \$4,000,000,000.

There seems to be a mistaken idea somewhere that the Federal Government has an exhaustible source of revenue, a fountain of gold that will never run dry. The notion seems to be that Government money is something unique, that it does not come out of the same pockets as State money, or municipal money, or private money.

I realize that the States' cost of doing business has also gone up, just as have the costs of the counties, the townships, the municipalities, and the school systems.

Figures showing the soaring costs of government and the division of those costs among the three levels of government offer opportunities for fascinating study.

For instance, in 1913, when the total cost of all government was \$2,656,000,000, 26 percent of the total was expended by the Federal Government, 14 percent by the States, and 60 percent represented the cost of local government.

Ten years later, in 1923, the picture had changed considerably. The total cost had risen to \$5,284,000,000. Local governments' share of the cost had dropped to 49 percent of the total, the States' percentage was unchanged at 14, while the Federal percentage had advanced to 37.

In 1940, with the total cost of government reaching \$17,918,000,000, there was a further rise in the Federal share to 49 percent. The State government portion of the total had advanced to 19 percent, while the percentage of local government expenditures had dropped once more to 33 percent.

If there were no other reason than the one I have mentioned—the belief that Uncle Sam has a private pipe line to Midas—I should still advocate returning to the States as much as possible of their former powers and responsibilities. Because, you see, people don't have the same idea about the States, the counties, and the cities.

They know, as night follows day, that they must pay out of their pockets for what Philadelphia, or Chicago, or Salt Lake City, or Green County, or Wayne township, or California spends.

Of course I am not advocating a return to 1790 or 1850. We cannot turn back to the division of responsibility and authority which existed then; our method of living has changed and our system has grown more complex. We must fit ourselves within the modern framework.

But between the sky of spending unlimited by Uncle Sam, and the sea of absolute minimum Federal expenditures, there is a horizon—a point of balance. In the past decade and a half, this horizon seemed to be located north of the sun, the moon, and the stars. It has been as unstable as the cow that

jumped over the moon, and just as high and giddy.

I propose that we do something about this. Let us join forces to find out where the horizon belongs. One way to help would be to bottle up those who approach Uncle Sam with their hands outstretched and the words, "give us a hand-out" on their lips.

I would like to recommend for your consideration the suggestion that there should be frequent meetings of the representatives of the three levels of government. The leaders of Congress should meet with representative leaders of State and local legislative bodies, to work out proper division of labor and responsibility. I realize, of course, that such a meeting would have no authority. It would be advisory.

But there are some things it could do. It could clear away a great deal of conflict and misunderstanding. It could help educate the people. It could drain from their systems the poison that makes so many turn to Washington morning, noon, and night for everything they want. It could take some of our people by the scruff of their necks and shake them back into their self-reliance which made our country great.

Such meetings could help simplify governmental functions and suggest allocation to each of the three levels the taxes needed to pay for such functions.

I would like to see a sharp redefinition of the traditional fundamental duties.

Local government is closest to the people. Its functions could well consist of care of the indigent, control of public schools, local police power, elections and local courts.

The State government could well have the duties of conservation, health, higher education, mental hospitals, stream pollution, flood control, and through-road systems.

The Federal Government, of course, has the great duty of national defense, care of veterans, currency, foreign affairs, rivers and harbors, and interstate relations, where necessary. Where State lines are crossed, the Federal Government must step in as arbitrator. For example, West Virginia and Pennsylvania pollute the Monongahela River, to the detriment of the States along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia pollute the Ohio River in its upper reaches—again to the damage of States lower down. If, upon reasonable notice, the offending States will not desist, the Federal Government should step in and force that necessary duty.

A start toward a redefinition of duties should be made without delay. It is easier not to start something than to relinquish it after the start has been made. Congress is under steady and relentless pressure from groups back home to spend more on some functions and to commence others. Once needless things get into a Federal budget, it seems to take atomic power to blast them out. The way to prevent such things is never to start them.

Our Federal Government is in bad fiscal shape. It has a \$258,000,000,000 debt. Despite strenuous efforts by Congress, the 1943 fiscal year may cost close to \$40,000,000,000 when the deficiency appropriations come in next spring—unless there is legislation to halt reckless spending in excess of authorizations.

Those figures can prove tragic if the National income falls off as little as 5 or 6 percent.

And this one thing I know, if the Federal Government goes down, all goes down. The States would go down even if they are well managed. Therefore, I urge again that the States step forward to reclaim their rights and responsibilities, and even though there be a tight squeeze that the State and local units refrain from seeking more financial help from Washington.

America is the last remaining hope of a free world. We cannot make the weak strong by making the strong weak. We cannot be



an influence for good in the world by destroying our own financial structure. If we fail—civilization may not have another chance for a hundred years.

**NOMINATION OF PHILIP B. PERLMAN—  
MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE**

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, to submit a resolution to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the nomination of Philip B. Perlman to be Solicitor General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire what, if any, interference to the pending bill his request would cause.

Mr. TYDINGS. None at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is it the intention that the resolution shall be taken up immediately for a vote?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; it will lie on the table.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Very well.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to make it clear that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman of the subcommittee—

Mr. TYDINGS. I am coming to that.

Mr. LANGER. Announced this morning that hearings would be held this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to make a brief explanation.

Mr. LANGER. We are going to vote on the nomination anyway within 2 or 3 days.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Ex. Res. 53), submitted by Mr. TYDINGS was received, as in executive session and ordered to lie over 1 day under the rule, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Philip B. Perlman to be Solicitor General of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like it clearly understood that in submitting the resolution to discharge the committee, I am doing it only as a precaution. If the Senate were to adjourn in the next 2 weeks and the hearings were not terminated, I might have difficulty, as a result of postponing action until too close to the end of the session, in obtaining effective and decisive Senate action on it. For that reason I have submitted the resolution simply as a precautionary measure.

I am advised that, as brought out by the able Senator from North Dakota, the Senate Judiciary Committee was advised this morning by the junior Senator from Michigan that he contemplated closing hearings on the Perlman nomination tonight, and it was implied that within a very short while thereafter it would be presented to the Committee on the Judiciary for action. With that prospect there is every probability the

nomination will be reported to the Senate prior to the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I might say the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], announced a special meeting of the committee this week, at which time the nomination will be considered.

Mr. TYDINGS. That was my advice. I thank the Senator. I wish to repeat, sometimes we make plans which do not always succeed. I have taken this precaution only in the event there should be a disarrangement of the contemplated plan by the subcommittee and by the able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to dispose of the matter from a committee standpoint within the next few days, certainly, at the outside. In the event the resolution were not entered now, a situation might arise which would preclude my offering it later. I have taken this step only as a matter of precaution. I am perfectly willing to wait until the committee—tonight, I hope—finishes its hearings, with the understanding that the full committee will be called to consider the nomination when the subcommittee concludes. I do not wish to comment on the merits of the case now, but I felt there was no other course left, with 2 weeks remaining of the session, if the Senate proceeds according to the schedule already agreed to, except to suggest such procedure as would imply that the Senator from Maryland, in justice to the nominee, would take action accordingly.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

**COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF POST-MASTER NOMINATIONS**

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, since both the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Illinois are on the floor, I wish to advise, in connection with the special resolutions submitted to discharge the Committee on Civil Service from the further consideration of nominations of postmasters, that by next Tuesday each one of those appointments will have been considered.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I reply to the Senator from South Dakota that since our last discussion on the floor the Senator from Maryland had reached the conclusion that the Senator from North Dakota was going to deal with these matters in due time and before the session is over, and he had no desire to press the matter. If the Senator had been present when the resolutions were originally submitted, probably a great deal of this controversy would never have taken place.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely want to associate myself with the Senator from Maryland in extending sincere thanks to the Senator from North Dakota for the very tolerant attitude he has taken in connection with the nominations of postmasters. I sincerely hope they will all be considered before adjournment, and that all of them will be reported favorably by the distinguished

Senator, because there are still a great many veterans who are languishing by the wayside as the result of delays that have occurred. I appreciate the Senator's position, and I want to thank him for the remarks he has made.

**REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES**

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3350) to reduce individual income-tax payments.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am glad to rise in support of the amendment offered by the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] on behalf of himself and other Senators, which is the pending question. My name, with those of other Senators, appears as one of the sponsors of the amendment, and I wish to say that it is entirely in keeping with the position I have taken upon the subject of tax reduction ever since that question has been raised in the Congress.

Earlier this year I introduced in the Senate a bill to relieve the people of my State of West Virginia from the discrimination against them which has existed over a period of years in favor of what were formerly 8 States of the Union and now are 13 States. That discrimination has yearly cost the people of my State the sum of \$5,355,000. Since I have heretofore asked that my own people be relieved of the discrimination, it was but natural that I should join with others in demanding that the people of all the States receive the same treatment, that there be real equality, and, I may say, equity done in the matter of income-tax levies and collections.

Moreover, it is in keeping with my view, which I have expressed in this forum and at other places, that where relief is to be given from the great burden of taxes upon our people very high consideration should be accorded those who have families to support. The pending amendment, Mr. President, reaches out to that end. It provides that the income earned by husband or wife may be divided equally between them, as is done in 13 States, and only 13 States, today. In that way, of course, family taxes will be lessened. The family will have more with which to pay for the needed commodities it must purchase. It will have more for the support of those who are dependents. There is no measure which has a more equitable and just appeal than the amendment which is now before the Senate to be voted upon.

Mr. President, the subject has been very thoroughly and ably discussed in the Senate, and I shall not take the time of the Senate in the closing days of the session to repeat or to elaborate upon the arguments which have been made. But I appeal to my colleagues, as a matter of reason, as a matter of right, as a matter of justice and equity, to adopt the amendment and to make it a part of the law in the great program of reducing the taxes laid upon the American people, a reduction which is sorely needed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not intend to take very much of the time of the Senate, but there are one or two observations I desire to make in support of the pending amendment. I, like the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], want to compliment the senior

Senator from Arkansas for the able way in which he has presented his arguments in favor of the amendment, and I do not propose to go over them.

I simply wish to emphasize two points, which have already been alluded to. One is that the adoption of the community-property laws in some of the States recently, especially Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Michigan was, by reason of the development of the progressive rate in income taxation, purely for the purpose of alleviating the tax burdens of the citizens of those States.

I wish to read one paragraph from a statement by Stanley S. Surrey, of the United States Treasury Department. It is reported in the *Tax* magazine, volume 24, No. 10, at page 982, in the issue of October 1946, under the heading "Family income and Federal taxation." I read as follows:

Finally, we must not forget that Oklahoma was motivated entirely by the tax factor. Formerly, it could be solemnly stated that the community system was an aspect of State policy respecting property holding and the material relationship adopted long ago without an eye to taxes. In short, it was at least respectable, and tax avoidance existed not in its origin but in its result. The community system would in this respect claim some kinship with joint tenancy or tenancy by the entirety, which in other States could also work wonders in splitting family income from property. But Oklahoma has stripped the community system of this moral cloak and brought it to the level of other tax avoidance schemes. The Oklahoma statute is purely tax motivated—the community system commends itself to the State only because of the Federal income-tax dollars it saves for its citizens.

While that article was written last October, I believe the same thing could be said of the action of the States which have recently adopted the same principle, that is Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Nebraska. So I do not think the whole question is properly discussed from the point of view of the family relationship, and so forth, as some of the opponents have contended, particularly opponents from community-property States. From our point of view the proposal now before the Senate is not a tax-reduction scheme. While it involves tax reduction in some instances, it is purely a tax-equalization measure. In other words, its purpose is to remove the inequities of the existing system.

One other point I wish to emphasize is that the amendment bears particularly upon people who derive their income from earnings, that is, salaried people, as opposed to persons whose income is derived from investments.

There is one short statement I wish to read from the June 27, 1947, issued of the United States News in the division called Finance Week, under the heading "New support for tax splitting." I read as follows:

Where his money comes from may be another factor. People with investment income sometimes can divide that income among members of the family through gifts of income-producing property, through family partnerships, family trusts, and other devices. Except in community-property States, where income splitting is automatic, this privilege is denied to salaried people.

How investments are divided among members of the family might determine the

amount of a family's tax. The Treasury points out that, because of family relationships and the nature of their investments, some families living on investment income cannot make use of tax-saving devices such as partnerships and trusts, while others effect big savings through such devices.

Income splitting, as the Treasury study shows, would help to eliminate all of these forms of tax-discrimination.

Residence in community-property States no longer would offer any tax advantage, because married couples in all States would be on the same tax basis.

Salaried people would get, by law, about the same income-splitting privilege that people with investment income now get through family trusts, partnerships, and other tax-saving devices.

All families with investment income would be put on more nearly the same footing, so far as taxes are concerned. In many cases, the incentive to divide income-producing property through trusts, gifts, and partnerships would disappear.

One of the arguments advanced in favor of the tax bill itself is that it will afford an incentive to those who devote their energies to various industries—I take it primarily salaried people. The benefit from the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arkansas and other Senators would accrue primarily and particularly to those very salaried people, as opposed to those who derive their income from investments.

Mr. President, I do not wish to go further in repeating the arguments. I sincerely hope that the Senate will give serious consideration to this amendment and approve it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Connor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eaton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] on behalf of himself and other Senators. On the amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, so that we may have a more exact understanding of the problem which we are

asked to solve on the Senate floor, I wish to make a very brief review of the community-property situation in the States which have community-property laws.

The community-property system rests on the theory that marriage is a partnership between husband and wife; that the wife is an equal contributor with the husband in the production of income, whether she works or does not work. In a series of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States it is well settled that the community property is possessed by the husband and wife by halves, and that the wife's interest in the community property is in all respects equal to that of her husband. Accordingly, in the States having the community-property system the community income is equally divisible between husband and wife and taxable to them at their election in separate income-tax returns.

There is a misapprehension that the community-property system was adopted as a method of tax avoidance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The statement has just been made that that was the purpose of it in Oklahoma. I did not refer to the States originally having the community-property system, but in regard to States which have recently adopted it I think it is very clear that that is the motive. I think the same statement applies in the case of Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Nebraska.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the distinguished Senator will "hold his horses" for a minute, I shall make the very distinction to which he alludes.

The community-property system which prevails in 13 States was recognized prior to the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution. It is based upon Spanish and civil laws which were enacted into statute and/or constitutions of those States before income taxes were a consideration.

The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] has told me, as I recall it, that the community-property system originated in Spain in the year 700 A. D.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I stated that it originated in the seventh century.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator. The States of Oklahoma, Oregon, the Territory of Hawaii, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, are late comers to the system. I would not for a moment pretend that the rather recent adoption of the community-property system by one or more of the later States is entirely free of tax-avoidance implications. What I am driving at, as I said before, is to illustrate the complexities of the problems which we are asked to solve on the Senate floor; and that, I believe, requires rather exact knowledge of what is involved so far as the community-property States are concerned.

Let me give the Senate a few examples of the system in action in a few of the States. Let us first consider Arizona.



In 1863 Arizona became a separate Territory, and 2 years later a law was enacted which definitely recognized the community-property system in that Territory. The system has continued under the laws of that State since that time.

Let me invite the attention of the Senate especially to what community property consists of in Arizona, because, generally speaking, the same pattern is followed in all the other community-property States. When there has been a deviation for a pure tax-avoidance purpose, without accepting the blessings or the handicaps of the philosophy of the system, as one may wish to view them, the Supreme Court has declared the effort ineffectual, so far as avoidance of Federal taxes is concerned.

Community property in Arizona consists of all property acquired by either husband or wife during marriage, except that which is acquired by gift, devise, or descent, or earned by the wife or her minor children in her custody while she has lived or may live separate and apart from her husband.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the test case of *Goodell v. Koch* (282 U. S. 118 (1930)) held that the wife in Arizona—and, roughly speaking, this is what the spouses have by way of property interest in income in all of the community-property States—has a vested present and subsisting interest in the community property and the right to file a separate tax return of one-half of the income arising therefrom. In general community income in Arizona consists of earnings of the husband or wife and the income from community property. However, the earnings of a wife and of her minor children in her custody while she is living or may live separate and apart from her husband is deemed to be the separate income of the wife.

The last-mentioned provision appears in the statutes of a number of community-property States.

Take the State of California. The California community-property system was originally incorporated in its constitution in 1849 by defining the separate property of the wife. In the early case of *United States v. Robbins* (269 U. S. 315), decided in 1925, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the wife, in California, did not possess a present subsisting right in one-half of the community property, but only an expectancy interest of survivorship.

Let us see what happened. It was accordingly held in the case mentioned that the income from such property was taxable to the husband as the administrative head and owner in enjoyment of the property. Thereafter the California law was amended. The pertinent provision is as follows:

The respective interests of the husband and wife in community property during continuance of the marriage relation are present, existing, and equal interests under the management and control of the husband as is provided in section 172 and 172a of the Civil Code. This section shall be construed as defining the respective interests and rights of husband and wife in community property.

In a subsequent income-tax case the Supreme Court ruled, in the case of *United States v. Malcolm* (282 U. S. 792), that the California amendment gives the wife in that State an equal present and vested interest in community property with her husband.

The glib assertion is sometimes made that this present and vested interest is only a theory in the community-property States; that the spouse who has the money owns it in fact and controls it and does as he or she pleases with it. If any of my colleagues are under that delusion, all that needs to be done to correct it is to look at the newspapers in community-property States when there is a divorce or a death.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. What the Senator is saying in regard to California is absolutely correct. I am somewhat informed on the subject. Many loose statements have been made to the effect that these laws are merely for effect, but the truth of the matter is that the community-property laws of California definitely give a vested right in the property, as the Senator has stated. In order to avoid such vested right in community property between the husband and the wife the husband and the wife can enter into an agreement not to live under that California rule. In that event the vested right in the property remains where they agree it shall remain, but I wish to call attention to the fact that when they enter into such an agreement, they can no longer avail themselves of the special taxation privilege which we are discussing.

Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say a further word, because I do not wish to consume much time now in discussing this tax question, let me say that I think the people of the United States want some tax reduction now. I think the people of the United States who want to pay their national debt want tax reductions so they can keep the industrial machine going and can produce the profits from which come the taxes with which the debt will be paid. I am as deeply interested in paying the national debt as any other American citizen can be, but I would not promise to attempt to pay it at a rate more rapid than we can maintain under normal procedures.

I am deeply interested in correcting the inequity and injustice between the States, which comes from some States having community-property laws and others not having such laws, but I should like to do it in such a way that it will be done correctly, and stand the test of the Supreme Court. A few moments ago I heard the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] talk about the labor legislation recently enacted and about the precipitate action which he suggests we should now try to undo. I think one of the problems before the Senate, and one of the mistakes which we wish to try to avoid in the future, is the hasty enactment of legislation which subsequently takes years to correct. I wish to point out particularly that when husband and

wife in California agree not to live under the community-property rights law, they do not have the advantage of the proposed Federal provision which gives the privilege of dividing income for Federal tax purposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's contribution.

Now let us consider Idaho. Idaho adopted the community-property law while she was a Territory. The Idaho code covers the property status of the spouses. It provides, briefly, that all property of the wife owned by her before marriage, and that which is acquired afterward by gift, bequest, devise, or descent, or that which she acquires with the proceeds of her separate property, shall remain her sole and separate property, to the same extent and with the same effect as that of the husband similarly acquired. With respect to the husband, it provides that all property owned by him before marriage and that acquired by gift, bequest, devise, or descent after marriage, is his separate property.

All other property acquired after the marriage by either husband or wife, including the rents and profits of the separate property of the husband and wife—and that provision is a considerable departure—is held to be the community property. In Idaho a case arose, and went to the supreme court of that State, in which it was held that the wife's interest in the community property is a present and vested interest moiety.

In Louisiana, the Territorial Legislature of Orleans, which in 1812 was admitted to the Union as Louisiana, as early as 1807, recognizing that the ancient Spanish laws, secured to them by the act of Congress of March 26, 1804, needed to be made more available, ordered a digest of the laws to be made. The digest was adopted March 31, 1808. It was superseded by the Louisiana Civil Code of 1825. The community-property system in Louisiana therefore antedates 1807, and has consistently been the law of that State up to the present time.

A case arose from that State, and went to the Supreme Court of the United States; and in that test case of *Bender v. Pfaff* (282 U. S. 127, in 1930), the Court held that the wife's interest in the marital community in Louisiana was a present, vested interest of one-half, and that she could file a separate tax return covering one-half of the community property.

That same pattern of law has long existed in Nevada, since Nevada was a Territory, and with roughly the same legal effects.

The same situation has existed in New Mexico since New Mexico was a Territory, and with roughly the same legal effects.

The community-property law of Oklahoma originally was made effective July 29, 1939. It was the first State to provide the elective features for the spouses, whereby they could elect to be governed in their property relations by that State's community-property law. The law as originally passed was refused recognition by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Subsequently, the United States Supreme Court held, in the test case of *Commissioner v. Harmon* (323 U. S. 44), that the

Oklahoma act of 1939 was ineffective for Federal income-tax purposes. In other words, that act did not really separate the ownership of the community property.

Thereafter, and on April 28, 1945, the Oklahoma Legislature repealed the 1939 act, and adopted a new community property law which contains no elective features, and which has met the tests, including the test of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Commissioner v. Harmon* (323 U. S. 44).

Texas also has had a community-property system since it was Spanish territory, and later while it was Mexican territory, and later while it was a republic, and ever since it has been a State of the Union; and in Texas the legal incidence of their system is much the same as that which I have mentioned as characterizing the other systems. The Supreme Court of the United States has examined the Texas system; and in the case of *Hopkins v. Bacon* (282 U. S. 122), the Supreme Court found that the wife in Texas has a present vested interest in the community property of one-half, and equal to that of her husband. Accordingly, it was held that husband and wife domiciled in Texas may, in rendering separate income-tax returns, each report one-half of the community income.

The same situation exists in the State of Washington, the Territory of Hawaii, and in the State of Oregon. As I have stated before, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Nebraska now have community property laws.

I do not mention this fact, or the facts which have been discussed, to negative the proposition that there is a strong cry to authorize the splitting of income all over the United States. The theory for that is that there is an equality and a real division in the consumption of the income, as distinguished from its ownership. The demand is so strong that I am inclined to believe, indeed I feel practically certain, that we will have a readjustment for Federal income tax purposes so that there may be Nation-wide splitting of incomes between the spouses. But the matter is related to gift taxes and estate taxes and trusts, and the benefits which the noncommunity States would receive under such a system will leave certain residual problems in the community-property States, which will have to be ironed out, and this cannot be done on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the position of the Senator now, that will be done next year?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has the written assurance of the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means that provisions rectifying injustices in the Federal tax treatment of family income will be included in the next revision bill, and I understand that before the chairman of the committee wrote that letter he received the authority to do so from the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. If the pending tax bill should be sustained over the President's

veto, the Senate, according to the Senator's statement in the newspaper this morning, will have before it the same kind of a tax bill next session. If this is true, may I inquire of the Senator from Colorado if it is his opinion that we will also have this community-property-tax amendment attached to it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My own thought in regard to that is that the bill for a general revision will come later in the next session, and that the income-tax-reduction bill, if the pending one shall be vetoed, will come early in any session of Congress between now and the next one, or in the next one.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator takes the position then that, under any circumstances, we are going to have two tax bills in the next year before the Congress of the United States; that is to say, we are going to have the pending tax bill re-introduced, and then we are going to have a general revision of the tax structure, including the community-property tax, which will cost the taxpayers at least another two or three or four billion dollars.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not concede we are going to have two bills in the next session, because I do not concede that the veto will be sustained, but assuming the veto shall be sustained, and assuming there will be no special session, I believe we will have two bills in the next session. I believe we will have an income-tax-reduction bill offered promptly at the beginning of the next session of Congress, and thereafter we will have a general revision bill.

Mr. LUCAS. It is very interesting, to say the least, to know that the majority now are planning that, in case the veto of the pending bill shall be sustained, there will be two tax bills in the national election year of 1948.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it is quite interesting to know the position the able Senator has taken—and I assume he is speaking for the majority party—that we will never get tax reform unless we pass a tax-reduction bill, and then we will get the revision or reform feature. I understand the majority party are keeping tax reduction in front of tax revision and the elimination of discrimination.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think there is somewhat of a distinction. The pending bill has been canvassed in the Congress, hearings have been held on it, and it is essentially a very simple piece of legislation. Therefore we are ready to move on it now, we will be ready to move on it in a special session, if there is one, and we will be ready to move on it in the next session if a veto shall be sustained.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator in his remarks thus far has referred to trying to legislate on this matter on the floor of the Senate. The Senate Committee on Finance was given an opportunity to consider the amendment when the origi-

nal bill was before it. I appeared before the committee and presented the amendment, and the committee had opportunity then to go into its ramifications, if and, and draft a proper amendment if this one was not adequate, or if there was some objection to its form. I merely want to keep the record straight that the amendment was presented, not the last time the committee was considering the bill, but when it had the original bill before it, because according to my information no hearings were held on the bill now pending.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to keep the record straight, that the majority of the Senate Committee on Finance has felt that this is a subject which is properly within the purview of a general revision statute, and is not properly a part of an income tax reduction statute. The House Committee on Ways and Means has commenced its studies in connection with the general revision bill. It has already had witnesses before it on the community property amendment. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has himself appeared before the committee in behalf of an amendment of this kind. This is related to 20 or more other group inequities which have to be considered together, and which are being so considered. We intend to correct special group inequities in a general revision bill, which will be in the next session of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very much interested in the pending community-property amendment. Since the last tax-reduction bill was considered, my State of Nebraska has passed a community-property statute. If I understand the colloquy between the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Arkansas correctly, at the beginning of the second session of the Eightieth Congress there will be a tax-reduction bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There will be a tax-revision bill during the next session of the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. That is not predicated on whether the Senate passes a tax-reduction bill at this time or in a special session, or even if we are to wait until 1948. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator's impression coincides entirely with the assurances which I have received from the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, which is the initiating committee in these matters. It coincides entirely with my own view, and I believe with the views of the majority of the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, we have heard the roll of State benefits under the proposed amendment. That is an interesting argument, but it is not an entirely conclusive test, because we could achieve more equalized benefits in the same amounts to those States by simply increasing the rate of reduction of taxes in the pending income-tax bill.

I should like to call the roll of the States which will receive benefits under the pending bill before us, and also the



roll of the States which will derive no benefit from the proposed amendment.

Alabama, under the bill, will get a benefit of \$30,190,000.

Arizona will get no benefit under the amendment, but will get a benefit of \$11,459,000 under the bill.

Arkansas will get a benefit under the bill of \$14,235,000.

California will get no benefit under the amendment, and will receive under the bill a benefit of \$415,959,000.

Colorado will receive a benefit of \$28,667,000 under the bill.

Connecticut will receive \$76,538,000.

Delaware will receive \$25,276,000.

Florida will receive \$54,942,000.

Georgia will receive \$43,032,000.

Idaho will receive no benefit under the amendment and will receive a benefit under the bill of \$9,161,000.

Of course, when I speak of the States, I am speaking of the income-tax payers in the States.

Illinois will receive a benefit of \$335,902,000 under the bill.

Indiana will receive a benefit of \$72,298,000.

Iowa will receive a benefit of \$40,876,000.

Kansas will receive a benefit of \$35,621,000.

Kentucky will receive a benefit of \$31,045,000.

Louisiana will receive no benefit under the amendment, and will receive a benefit of \$36,834,000 under the bill.

Maine will receive a benefit under the bill of \$14,541,000.

Maryland will receive a benefit of \$140,830,000.

Massachusetts will receive a benefit of \$167,327,000.

Michigan will receive no benefit under the amendment, but will receive \$197,042,000 under the bill.

Minnesota will receive a benefit of \$62,362,000 under the bill.

Mississippi will receive a benefit of \$12,529,000.

Missouri will receive a benefit of \$94,432,000.

Montana will receive a benefit of \$8,928,000.

Nebraska will receive no benefit under the amendment, a benefit of \$30,724,000 under the bill.

Nevada will receive no benefit under the amendment, a benefit of \$6,363,000 under the bill.

New Hampshire will receive a benefit of \$9,783,000 under the bill.

New Jersey, \$139,887,000.

New Mexico, no benefit under the amendment; under the bill, \$7,135,000.

New York, under the bill, \$800,608,000.

North Carolina, \$41,381,000.

North Dakota, \$7,549,000.

Ohio, \$227,513,000.

Oklahoma, no benefit under the amendment; under the bill, \$31,474,000.

Oregon, no benefit under the amendment; \$38,991,000 under the bill.

Pennsylvania, no benefit under the amendment; \$307,627,000 under the bill.

Rhode Island, \$25,086,000 under the bill.

South Carolina, \$17,381,000.

South Dakota, \$7,159,000.

Tennessee, \$39,382,000.

Texas, \$133,098,000, under the bill; nothing, under the amendment.

Utah, \$10,658,000.

Vermont, \$5,177,000.

Virginia, \$46,555,000.

Washington, under the amendment, nothing; under the bill, \$73,412,000.

West Virginia, \$21,690,000, under the bill.

Wisconsin, \$69,495,000, under the bill.

Wyoming, \$4,776,000, under the bill.

It may be asked, "Why not do both? Why not add the community-property amendment to the existing bill, and add the benefits contemplated by it to those contemplated by the bill, and pass it in that way?" That is a fair question, and it should be met squarely. I shall give several reasons against doing so. One of them appears in a statement which was made by Secretary Snyder when he appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in connection with a general revision bill. Under the heading of "Family income," he said:

Under present law there are inequalities in taxation of families arising out of the fact that couples in community-property States are permitted to divide their community earned and investment income for Federal income tax purposes, thereby reducing their taxes under the progressive rate schedule. There are also inequalities arising out of the fact that in all States recipients of investment income have opportunities for splitting that income among members of the family, whereas in non-community-property States earned income is taxed to the earner. The tax value of income splitting varies with size of income. Couples with not more than \$2,000 of net income after exemptions can realize no tax benefit from income splitting—

To that statement I invite especially the attention of those who are clamoring for greater benefits for those in the lower income-tax brackets—

whereas under the graduated rates couples with large incomes may realize substantial benefits. These tax savings have created difficult administrative problems and endless litigation in the field of family trusts, family partnerships, and various other types of property assignments.

Over a period of years the Congress and the Treasury have both considered means of eliminating or reducing the resulting tax inequalities among similarly situated families, but no adequate solution of the problem has been adopted. One limited approach that has been considered in the past would be to eliminate the tax advantages of the community property system by taxing earned income to the earner and other community property income to the spouse who exercises management and control. A more comprehensive approach to the problem, which has also received congressional attention in the past, would be to require joint tax returns by husbands and wives. Still another approach, which has only recently been given widespread attention, would be to eliminate tax differences resulting from income splitting between husbands and wives by granting couples in all States the option to divide their combined incomes for tax purposes.

The existing inequalities in taxes on family incomes are significant and call for careful consideration of this problem. It must be recognized that the various solutions that have been suggested would have different but important effects on the revenue yield of the income tax and on the distribution of taxes among different income groups and between married and single persons. It is, therefore, desirable to consider the family

income problem in connection with any comprehensive revision of the individual tax.

I wish to repeat that the House Ways and Means Committee, assisted by a group of outstanding experts, not only the experts of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, but experts who have been brought in for the purpose, are canvassing and sifting the whole field of Federal revenue law, and are getting ready to present a revision bill which will aim at group inequities and other defects under present law—and there are a dozen or more of them which I could mention which also have claims on our sense of fairness. Such a general revision bill will come before the next session of the Congress. This study is not something that is being promised; it is not something that we may hope to obtain at some future time. It has been under way. It will continue under way. As I said a while ago, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas presented this precise problem to the House Ways and Means Committee while it was hearing witnesses on the subject.

There is another reason why the amendment of the able Senator from Arkansas should not be made a part of the pending bill. It is the desire of an overwhelming majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress that the bill be a simple measure limited and beamed to one objective, namely, income-tax reduction. The bill will benefit 49,500,000 income taxpayers—every one of them. There are no discriminations. Any one falling within a certain bracket gets equal treatment with all others in that bracket. The treatment ranges in percentage from the highest tax cut in the lowest bracket, to the lowest in the highest, but every income taxpayer will receive a benefit under this measure. It has that simple, direct purpose. It is not a revision bill; it was never intended to be one. Group inequities will be treated in a general revision bill.

What is it we are asked to do here, in the way of incorporating an amendment into the bill? The amendment would not benefit the entire 49,500,000 taxpayers; it would benefit but a limited group, who find themselves in brackets which are already being treated most generously by the bill which is before the Senate.

It has been asked, "How will we answer questions when we go home?" I reply, How will we square ourselves with our constituents when we go home if we take a bill which rests on fair and equitable treatment all the way along the line, from bottom to top and say "Yes, in the last minute of the debate we added a \$750,000,000 windfall for a limited group of people, who were already receiving a great benefit under the income-tax-reduction bill before us. While we are thinking about the questions we shall have to answer when we go home let us think about that question. Let us not be fools. What is the nature of the benefit? Who receives it? Those having family incomes of \$10,000 and up. On \$10,000 and less it is negligible. Persons with incomes of \$2,000 and less would get nothing from the amendment. I empha-

size this again to those who are talking about specific additional benefits for those in the lower-income-tax brackets. Those in the highest brackets get nothing. The \$750,000,000 or \$800,000,000 windfall would be centered in the middle brackets of the pending income-tax reduction bill which already afford an income-tax reduction of 20 percent.

Does that mean that there will never be relief in this field. I repeat, and I shall continue to repeat, that there are inequities in a dozen or 15 groups, all having a right to have their problems considered together, all having the right to have their adjustments coordinated and brought into fair relationship with each other, and that job will be done in a revision bill which will come before the next session of Congress.

I repeat, the intended benefits of the pending bill are uniform to all according to the brackets in which they find themselves. No income taxpayer is deprived of relief. No income taxpayer receives any benefits which are not equally available to all who find themselves within the same controlling brackets. The benefits are graduated from 30-percent tax reduction in the lowest brackets to 10½ percent in the highest.

The amendment at this time opposes our primary purpose, the primary purpose of the overwhelming majority of the Congress, to give relief, because we can give it now, without further consideration, by way of income-tax reduction.

What is the nature of the special group benefit which is sought by the amendment? Let us see whether it distributes itself equally and fairly to all who find themselves in the same status. It goes to the family relationship. Who does it benefit? In the family relationship it benefits a husband or a spouse who has all the income of the family. It does not benefit husbands and wives where the income is split, where they both work, where they both contribute about equally to the family income. They do not receive anything important from the amendment. It does not give any benefit, substantially speaking, where there is an approximation of equal income. It does not help a person who is single. We talk about the family relationship, and doing fairness in that relationship, and we should. Is not a widow who is looking after her children representative of a family relationship that should be cherished? Not one penny of benefit goes to her under the amendment. The same statement applies in the case of a widower who is looking after his dependent children. It equally applies in the case of children who are supporting parents.

The amendment does not equalize benefits. It does not spread itself over the whole front of income-tax taxpayers. It has its merits in a general revision bill, and there is where it will find itself. It will have action in the next session of Congress. But when we are bringing to the public's attention and are focusing the public mind on the fact that there is now to be an income-tax reduction fairly applied to every income taxpayer, it would be the height of folly to introduce a specially focused, limited, group benefit on top of the benefits already provided

by the proposed income-tax reduction bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

On the amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent. On this vote I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOLSON] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 52, as follows:

#### YEAS—40

Aiken	Lucas	O'Mahoney
Brooks	McCarran	Pepper
Chavez	McCarthy	Revercomb
Eastland	McClellan	Robertson, Wyo.
Fulbright	McGrath	Russell
Green	McKellar	Sparkman
Hill	McMahon	Stewart
Hoey	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Holland	Maybank	Tydings
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Umstead
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Williams
Kilgore	Myers	Wilson
Langer	O'Connor	
Lodge	O'Daniel	

#### NAYS—52

Baldwin	Dworschak	Millikin
Ball	Eaton	Moore
Barkley	Ellender	Overton
Brewster	Ferguson	Reed
Bricker	Flanders	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	George	Saltonstall
Buck	Gurney	Smith
Bushfield	Hatch	Taft
Butler	Hawkes	Taylor
Byrd	Hayden	Thye
Cain	Hickenlooper	Vandenberg
Capehart	Ives	Watkins
Capper	Jenner	Wherry
Connally	Kem	White
Cooper	Knowland	Wiley
Cordon	McFarland	Young
Donnell	Malone	
Downey	Martin	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Thomas, Utah	Tobey	Wagner
--------------	-------	--------

So Mr. McCLELLAN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on Saturday I sent to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which incorporates the amendment on which we recently voted. It is an effort to equalize the system Nation-wide under the present tax law, and is offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]

and myself as a substitute for the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia for himself and the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That so much of section 12 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the computation of surtax) as precedes the table therein is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Computation of surtax.—

"(1) Separate return: Except in the case of a joint return by husband and wife, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the surtax net income of every individual a surtax determined by computing a tentative surtax under the table set forth in paragraph (3) of this subsection, and by reducing such tentative surtax by 5 percent thereof.

"(2) Joint return: In the case of a joint return by husband and wife under section 51, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the aggregate surtax net income of the husband and wife a surtax determined—

"(A) by computing a tentative surtax under the table set forth in paragraph (3) of this subsection upon an amount equal to one-half of such aggregate surtax net income;

"(B) by multiplying the tentative surtax ascertained under subparagraph (A) by two; and

"(C) by reducing the amount ascertained under subparagraph (B) by 5 percent thereof.

"(3) Surtax table: The table referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) is as follows:"

#### STANDARD DEDUCTION

SEC. 2. Section 23 (aa) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the optional standard deduction for individuals) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Allowance: In the case of an individual, at his election a standard deduction as follows:

"(A) Separate return with adjusted gross income \$5,000 or more: Except in the case of a joint return by husband and wife, if the adjusted gross income is \$5,000 or more, the standard deduction shall be \$500.

"(B) Joint return with adjusted gross income \$5,000 or more: In the case of a joint return by husband and wife under section 51, if the aggregate adjusted gross income of the husband and wife is \$5,000 or more, the standard deduction shall be \$1,000 or an amount equal to 10 percent of such aggregate adjusted gross income, whichever is the lesser.

"(C) Adjusted gross income less than \$5,000: If the adjusted gross income is less than \$5,000, the standard deduction shall be an amount equal to 10 percent of the adjusted gross income upon the basis of which the tax applicable to the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer is determined under the tax table provided in section 400."

#### TAXABLE YEARS TO WHICH APPLICABLE

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, after the first paragraph the amendment is identical with the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who joins me in offering this amendment as a substitute for the bill. It has been ably discussed.

I disagree with the very able argument of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who says that in assessing Federal taxes we should abide by the actions



of our State legislatures. I think that as a Federal Government we should equalize taxes. For that reason I urge the adoption of this amendment as a substitute, and as an amendment to existing income-tax law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia for himself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. What is the amendment? As I understand, it is the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas plus something. What else?

Mr. KILGORE. Plus nothing. It is offered as a substitute for the pending bill. It is offered as an amendment to the existing income-tax law.

Mr. OVERTON. Is it the same as the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. KILGORE. Exactly the same, but it is offered as an amendment to existing tax law, rather than as an amendment to the pending bill. It is offered as a substitute therefor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. If I correctly understand what the Senator from West Virginia proposes, it is that this amendment, which is identical with the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, shall be a substitute for the entire bill.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. If his substitute were adopted, it would become the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. The present existing tax law, subject to this amendment, would be in effect, without the pending bill.

Mr. HATCH. It is a complete substitute for the pending bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Exactly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What are the significant features of the amendment?

Mr. KILGORE. The reason for the amendment is that, in my humble opinion, the existing tax law should be changed by way of equalizing the payment of taxes, rather than necessarily by a reduction. This amendment would effect only a small reduction, but it would equalize the payment of taxes as between community-property States and other States, without affecting existing tax laws.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the amount of the reduction in revenue?

Mr. KILGORE. It is my information that it is approximately \$300,000,000. It would make people in all the States pay income taxes on the same basis.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it provide the income-tax reductions which are provided in the present bill?

Mr. KILGORE. No. It is a substitute for the pending bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. For the community-property amendment?

Mr. KILGORE. It is really an amendment to existing law, offered as a substitute for the pending measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for himself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, as I understand, if we adopt the Senator's amendment, it will be a substitute for the ending bill and will simply substitute the McClellan amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that tomorrow evening, at 10:45, on the American Broadcasting Co. chain, it will be my privilege to discuss the pending tax bill. I assume to give that notice in order that those who may wish to listen may know that the discussion will take place at that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will take due and timely notice.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk another amendment, which I wish to call up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed at the end of the bill to add the following new section:

SEC. 7. Family partnerships, partners not contributing to partnership funds.

(a) Section 3797 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence, as follows: "The fact that he is related to another member, or that his interest in such syndicate, group, pool, joint venture, or organization may have been obtained through gift or loan from another member, or without the contribution by himself of any money or other property, shall not affect a member's status as a partner."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1938.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I want to make a very brief statement.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue recognizes community-property laws. Because the Bureau does recognize them, and rightly so, I contend that it is absolutely proper that the Bureau of Internal Revenue recognize State partnership laws relating to property as between husband and wife. Having recognized community-property laws such as we have discussed for the past several days, I insist that the same Bureau of the Government should be required by law to recognize partnership statutes of the several States. Under the application and operation of the law as it now exists, ac-

cording to the interpretation and the rules and regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, assuming that I want my wife to become an equal partner with me in my business in Arkansas, under Arkansas laws, I may, by gift, confer upon her one-half of all the property I own, one-half of all my business, a one-half interest in all my income, and make it legal and binding under the laws of my State. But the Bureau of Internal Revenue will not recognize it. They say it is a device to evade taxes. What about the States which are now passing community-property laws? Read what the Governor of Pennsylvania said recently when he signed the bill providing a community-property system for his State. He said it was not to evade taxes, but to have just taxation and to prevent discrimination.

All that I ask in this amendment is that the Bureau of Internal Revenue be required to recognize and to give validity and force to State partnership laws. It may be said, "Well, it is merely a device to evade taxes." In Arkansas I can form a partnership with another citizen of my State and make him a gift of a one-half interest in my business, pay the gift tax on it, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue will recognize it as valid and binding. But if I make such a gift to my wife or to my son or to some other member of my family, which would be the most natural thing for me to do, it is said, "No; that is a device or an action to enable the family to evade taxes." I feel that if a State has the right to pass a community-property law and receive the advantage of it, why should not I, as a citizen, under the laws of my State, have a right to form a partnership with my wife or with a member of my family and have it recognized by the same tribunal and the same Government which recognizes the other situation?

That is what this amendment provides. I earnestly ask the Members of the Senate to vote for it.

Are we not to have any fairness in our tax laws anywhere? Since when are we afraid to legislate honestly and squarely and to face the issue?

If this amendment shall be agreed to, it will not cause any great loss in revenue. Certainly it would take many years of operation before it would accumulate the loss which would arise by passing the community-property amendment which I offered. It would simply compel the Bureau of Internal Revenue to recognize the laws of the States and to recognize partnership relations between husband and wife and between the husband and other members of the family. The Bureau of Internal Revenue recognizes the law in regard to someone who is unrelated. It recognizes the law and cannot do anything about it; but if one wishes to give his wife or child an interest in his business, it is said that it is wholly for the purpose of evading taxes, and is, in a sense, a fraud upon the Government.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, this amendment goes to what is a colorable transaction between husband and wife

for the evasion of income taxes. Personally, I believe the Bureau of Internal Revenue in many cases has been over-suspicious and has not acted wisely. I believe there should be a redefinition that will minimize the amount of discretion which the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury Department can use in these cases. But I point out to my colleagues that definitions which exclude colorable transactions will always be required if we wish to protect the Federal revenues. This subject is intimately connected with the community-property subject. It is intimately connected with the whole subject of family relations as they are affected by taxation. It has other ramifications. It is among the subjects which are under study by the House Ways and Means Committee. I am hopeful that out of the study there will come something constructive which will enable the Federal Government to protect its revenues against colorable transactions and, at the same time, limit the field of the Treasury and of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in annoying people who have made honest gifts and are conducting honest transactions. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I make the same announcement that I previously made as to the transfer of my pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Having transferred the pair, I am at liberty to vote; and I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is unavoidably detained on committee business. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business at important committee meetings.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, has been announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business, appearing before a committee of the House of Representatives.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the

Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 61, as follows:

## YEAS—25

Brooks	Langer	Murray
Capehart	Lodge	O'Connor
Eastland	Lucas	Russell
Fulbright	McCarthy	Stewart
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McKellar	Tydings
Hoey	Magnuson	Umstead
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	
Kilgore	Morse	

## NAYS—61

Alken	Flanders	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	George	Overton
Barkley	Green	Reed
Brewster	Gurney	Revercomb
Bricker	Hatch	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Hayden	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Ives	Smith
Butler	Jenner	Taft
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taylor
Cain	Kem	Thye
Capper	Knowland	Vandenberg
Connally	McCarran	Watkins
Cooper	McFarland	Wherry
Cordon	McMahon	White
Donnell	Malone	Wiley
Downey	Martin	Williams
Dworschak	Millikin	Wilson
Eaton	Moore	Young
Ellender	Myers	
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

## NOT VOTING—9

Ball	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Pepper	Tobey
Holland	Sparkman	Wagner

So Mr. McCLELLAN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I call up the amendment marked "C," which is at the desk. I send up a copy of the amendment in a modified form.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas offers an amendment. Does the Senator wish to have it read?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can state what it provides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed in the Record, and the Senator will then make a statement.

The amendment proposed by Mr. McCLELLAN proposes, at the proper place in the bill, a new section, as follows:

## SEC. —. Increase in personal exemption.

(a) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(A) In the case of a single person or a married person not living with husband or wife, a personal exemption of \$600.

"(B) In the case of the head of a family or a married person living with husband or wife, a personal exemption of \$1,200. A husband and wife living together shall receive but one personal exemption. The amount of such exemption shall be \$1,200. If such husband and wife make separate returns, the personal exemption may be taken by either or divided between them."

(b) Sections 51 (a), 58 (a) (1), 58 (a) (2), and 142 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, are amended by striking out "\$500" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$600."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

Amend the tables contained in sections 400, 1622 (b) (1), and 1622 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code to conform to the above amendments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment, to raise personal

exemptions. When I offered the amendment to the bill as originally proposed I intended to raise the personal exemption of single persons from \$500 to \$750, and of married persons or heads of families from \$1,000, as it is now, to \$1,500. I have now modified the amendment as I originally offered it so as to raise the personal exemption to \$600 for single persons, and to \$1,200 for heads of families.

There is no use arguing the amendment. Senators know they are either for it or do not favor it. I know it will be said it would increase the loss of revenues to result from enactment of the bill. Certainly it would. That is what we are doing, proposing to lose revenues, and if we are to lose revenues, and keep on losing them, I want to lose some to the advantage and for relief to wage earners and small-salaried folks who are trying to make a living, who are having a hard struggle to meet the high cost of living. I should like to remove some of them from the Federal tax rolls. They are the ones who need tax relief most. Their tax burden is much greater than many whom this bill is designed to benefit.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Can the Senator tell us what the cost of the amendment, as modified, would be?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe the Senator from Illinois could answer the question. He had a similar amendment when the tax bill was before the Senate on a previous occasion, and, as I recall, the cost was a billion and some million dollars. Does the Senator from Illinois recall?

Mr. LUCAS. What is the inquiry of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was asking the distinguished Senator from Arkansas what the loss of revenue would be as a result of the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. This would increase the exemption from \$500 to \$600?

Mr. McCLELLAN. And from \$1,000 to \$1,200.

Mr. LUCAS. The loss of revenue would be a billion and a half dollars.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As the amendment was originally drawn, for \$750 and \$1,500 the loss would have been \$3,900,000,000, and it is roughly half of that, or \$1,800,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. According to the estimate of the staff, on the basis proposed, it would be \$1,800,000,000?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That would be in addition to the reduction in revenue provided by the bill before the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Oh, yes; it would be in addition. I understand that. I am merely offering it as an amendment. It would be an addition, unless in conference the conferees made some adjustments in the rates in higher-income brackets now in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am trying to find out just what amendment the Senator is offering. There is one amendment, the one marked "B," offered on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas and seven or eight other Senators, and there is an amendment which the Senator is offering for himself alone.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Which is the one the Senator is offering now?



Mr. McCLELLAN. Amendment C, raising the personal exemptions, except that I have modified it as it was printed, and wherever "\$750" appears I have made the figure "\$600," and wherever "\$1,500" appears I have made it "\$1,200."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it must be understood that the amendment would apply to the calendar year starting January 1, 1948, and that so far as the fiscal year is concerned, the loss of revenue would be only half of approximately one and a half billion dollars.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct, because it would not go into effect until the bill went into effect, next January 1. Actually it would affect half the fiscal year, and therefore the loss for the fiscal year would not be more than half the billion eight hundred million.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to have it made clear whether, under the Senator's conception, for the full fiscal year the cost of his amendment would be an additional \$1,800,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that is the estimate of the staff of the joint committee, of course I accept it. Their judgment should be better than mine.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado tell me just where the additional \$300,000,000 comes from?

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the question?

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator advise the Senator from Illinois where the additional \$300,000,000 comes from? All through the testimony before the Committee on Finance there was no witness from the staff, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, or the Treasury Department, who said the loss would exceed more than a billion and a half.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It comes because of the increase in the level of national individual income payments. The Senator before was figuring on an average annual income much lower than we are now figuring on.

Mr. LUCAS. I can understand that there would be some difference, but every time we debate the bill we get a new set of figures on each and every one of the propositions. From the very beginning, from the time we started taking testimony before the Committee on Finance, we got different figures from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, we got different figures from the Treasury Department, we got different figures from every expert who appeared. I presume there was some reason for that, and I accept the reason given.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Those figures vary according to the view of what the national individual income payments will be during the fiscal year.

Mr. LUCAS. It is still rather confusing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Connor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eaton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Willey
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	
Hatch	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained on committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 47, as follows:

#### YEAS—43

Alken	Langer	O'Daniel
Brooks	Lodge	Pepper
Chavez	Lucas	Revercomb
Downey	McCarran	Robertson, Va.
Eastland	McClellan	Russell
Ferguson	McFarland	Sparkman
Fulbright	McGrath	Stewart
Green	McKellar	Taylor
Hill	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	Magnuson	Tydings
Holland	Maybank	Umstead
Ives	Murray	Watkins
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	Wilson
Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor	
Kilgore		

#### NAYS—47

Baldwin	Dworshak	Millikin
Ball	Eaton	Moore
Barkley	Ellender	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Flanders	Overton
Bricker	George	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Gurney	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Hatch	Smith
Butler	Hawkes	Taft
Byrd	Hayden	Thye
Cain	Hickenlooper	Vandenberg
Capehart	Jenner	Wherry
Capper	Kem	White
Connally	Knowland	Willey
Cooper	McCarthy	Williams
Cordon	Malone	Young
Donnell	Martin	

#### NOT VOTING—5

Bridges	Thomas, Utah	Wagner
Reed	Tobey	

So Mr. McCLELLAN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of the debate on the tax bill, an editorial published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 9, 1947, which comments upon the abandonment by the Republican leadership in the tax bill of the supposed principles of the Republican Party.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE HOUSE SUCCUMBED

One of Oscar Wilde's wisecracks was that the best way to overcome temptation is to succumb to it. Which is what the House did yesterday when it passed the second Knutson bill. On the theory that 49,000,000 taxpayers can't be displeased if \$4,000,000,000 is lopped off their income-tax bills, the House plumped for this unstatesmanlike measure by a vote of 302 to 112. That's more than enough to override another Presidential veto.

In his rejection of the first Knutson bill (identical to the present one except that the effective date has been changed from July 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948), Mr. Truman summed up the arguments against it. Those arguments still hold. Business is booming in the country and needs no spur in the form of lower taxes. Inflation is threatening and to pour \$4,000,000,000 into people's pockets will aggravate inflationary pressures. The public debt is astronomically high, and it behooves the country to reduce it while the reducing it good. Vast international commitments are being made and the money has got to be found to honor them.

Under all the circumstances, the wise and strong thing to do is to keep taxes at their present level. But the House, under the leadership of the GOP, saw fit to court the voters and to make hay for the 1948 Presidential year. This kind of opportunism is likely to plague the opportunists. The GOP has long prided itself on its sound fiscal policies, its zeal for budget balancing, and its concern over the public debt. None of these principles was honored in yesterday's performance.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 7. Taxation of trailer coaches. Section 3403 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by inserting after "tractors" the following words: "and except trailer coaches, their furnishings and equipment."

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the object of the amendment is simply to amend the Revenue Code so as to remove the tax on trailer houses. The tax was imposed on trailer houses at a time when they were considered to be a luxury. The purpose was to discourage their manufacture, and to put the energy and the materials so used into war production. The picture now has entirely changed. Seventy percent of the trailer houses sold last year were sold to veterans. The industry has set aside 60 percent this year for the veterans. The trailer houses are no longer a luxury. They are homes for veterans. Those buying the trailer houses must pay a tax of 7 percent on each trailer house, which amounts to \$100, and sometimes up to as high as \$200. With homes so scarce and the veterans so hard pressed, I think we could do no better than to remove this tax on trailer homes which veterans use for homes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. The editorial discusses the bill with relationship to the Marshall plan.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### DETERMINED, BUT BLIND

Like a blind mule with a hot foot, Congress is plunging importunately along toward repassage of the tax-reduction bill, the only change being to make the effective date next January 1 instead of July 1, 1947.

Congress seems determined to try to adjust the Nation's spending to a new tax rate rather than to adjust the tax rate to spending requirements as logic dictates.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 Congress was required by last February 15 to adopt a joint resolution putting a ceiling on Government expenditures for the current fiscal year.

Nearly 5 months after the deadline, Congress still hasn't agreed on how much can be cut from the President's \$37,500,000,000 budget and has not adopted a budget resolution. Economy-minded Senator Bryan, of Virginia, has announced quite properly that he will not support a tax reduction until this is done. We hope that enough Senators to sustain another Presidential veto will take the same sound position.

There is another compelling reason for proceeding carefully in fiscal affairs.

On July 12 most of the nations of Europe are expected to gather in Paris to start work on a European recovery plan suggested by Secretary of State Marshall.

Britain and France, who have taken the initiative in European recovery, are in as much haste to survey Europe's needs as Congress is to cut taxes. They can be expected to present us with a plan late in the summer or early in the fall.

Unofficial estimates have been that we will be asked to provide assistance in the sum of five or six billion dollars a year for the next 4 years.

When the recovery plan is presented, Congress will face a momentous decision. It can support Secretary Marshall's suggestion and help Europe get back on its feet in our own national self-interest or it can give

world communism a wonderful opportunity to sneer and say, "I told you so."

We need have no doubt that Russian refusal to participate in European recovery is well calculated upon the possibility that we will renege on Secretary Marshall's proposal, thus discrediting this country in the eyes of the world.

To follow through on the Marshall proposal and thus frustrate Russian ambition to control Europe, Congress probably will be asked to spend considerably more than the four billion it expects to save in a tax reduction. Weighing the possibilities in grave decisions ahead, we might yet do well to keep the budget balanced at the present tax rate, with little or nothing left for debt retirement.

We favor a tax reduction in principle. We also support heartily any Government economy that serves the national interest. Unquestionably there is great popular support for strong arguments in favor of relief from burdensome taxes now that the war is over.

But we believe it is the better part of wisdom to proceed cautiously at this time, accumulating as much surplus as possible during a period of prosperity, determining more fully the demands upon our economy before reducing our ability to meet them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MILLIKIN and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent. On this vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is necessarily absent because of illness in his family, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 32, as follows:

#### YEAS—60

Aiken	Bridges	Byrd
Baldwin	Brooks	Cain
Ball	Buck	Capehart
Brewster	Bushfield	Capper
Bricker	Butler	Cooper

Cordon	Knowland	Saltonstall
Donnell	Lodge	Smith
Dworshak	McCarran	Stewart
Eaton	McCarthy	Taft
Ferguson	McKellar	Thye
Flanders	Malone	Tydings
George	Martin	Umstead
Gurney	Millikin	Vandenberg
Hawkes	Moore	Watkins
Hickenlooper	O'Connor	Wherry
Hoey	O'Daniel	White
Ives	Reed	Wiley
Jenner	Revercomb	Williams
Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.	Wilson
Kem	Robertson, Wyo.	Young

#### NAYS—32

Barkley	Holland	Morse
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Connally	Kilgore	Myers
Downey	Langer	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Lucas	Overton
Ellender	McClellan	Pepper
Fulbright	McFarland	Russell
Green	McGrath	Sparkman
Hatch	McMahon	Taylor
Hayden	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Maybank	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Thomas, Utah	Tobey	Wagner
--------------	-------	--------

So the bill (H. R. 3950) was passed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, late a Representative from the State of Texas, and transmitted the resolution of the House thereon.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 129) to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3601, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

#### FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—REFERENCE OF NOMINATION OF BURTON N. BEHLING

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his courtesy in yielding to me. I desire to make a very brief statement, and then to proffer a unanimous consent request. There is on the desk a resolution, Senate Executive Resolution 52, submitted by me several days ago, proposing the discharge of the Committee on Public Works from further consideration of the nomination of Mr. Burton N. Behling to be a member of the



Federal Power Commission, and providing for the rereference of the nomination to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The question is controversial. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] will agree with me when I say that he and I have discussed this matter back and forth many times in the hope that we might find some adjustment of our differences and avoid bringing the question of committee jurisdiction to the floor of the Senate itself. But we have failed in our efforts, and we have reached the conclusion that our differences are irreconcilable, and that the question can be settled only by the Senate itself.

I desire, first, as in executive session, to ask unanimous consent that when the pending measure, in charge of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], is disposed of the Senate, in executive session, may proceed to the consideration of Senate Executive Resolution 52, which lies on the desk, making that the unfinished business of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what is the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. The resolution proposes to discharge the Committee on Public Works from further consideration of the nomination of Burton N. Behling to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, and to refer the nomination to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where nominations of this character have gone from time immemorial, and where jurisdiction has been unchallenged until lately.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I join in the request by the majority leader, that after the pending business is disposed of we proceed, in executive session, to consider the issue raised by the executive resolution now on the table.

I think the Senate ought to know about this case, and the urgency of it. The nomination of Burton N. Behling to be a member of the Federal Power Commission was sent to the Senate by the President on May 5 of this year. It was referred—and I feel properly so, although we shall take that subject up later—to the Committee on Public Works, where it arrived on May 6.

I want the record to show that on May 6, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I wrote to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Power, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], requesting that he proceed at once with hearings upon this nomination. Before such hearings could be had the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], requested me to hold up further proceedings on the nomination, saying that his committee protested the jurisdiction of our committee with respect to the appointment. The counsel for the Committee on Public Works has prepared an extensive brief, and I understand that the counsel for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has also prepared a brief. This matter must be disposed of. We must proceed with

hearings promptly, because it would be utterly unfair to the nominee to delay. A decision must be made, and for that reason we must proceed, as I say, promptly to settle the matter of jurisdiction and the question of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]? The Chair hears none; and the order is made.

#### IMPORTANCE OF HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I earnestly hope that some general housing legislation may be enacted by the Senate before we conclude our work. I realize that time is short. I also realize that writing legislation that will help build more low-cost homes is extremely difficult, but the fact still remains that housing is one of our greatest domestic problems. For that reason, I feel that we should make this genuine effort to encourage more decent housing for our veterans and civilians in the lower-income brackets. I understand perfectly that this problem cannot be overcome by legislation alone. I know there is no magic way to bring down the present high cost of construction and to prevent recurrent shortages of materials. I have received a most interesting statement of the housing problem in Massachusetts from Lewis H. Weinstein, chairman of the State board of housing. These statistics speak for themselves, and I know Massachusetts is not alone in this situation by any means. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include his brief statement on Massachusetts housing needs as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NEED FOR HOUSING IN MASSACHUSETTS

It is estimated that the families of 50,000 Massachusetts veterans are in desperate need of housing. It is also estimated that there will be a need for about 350,000 new residential units in Massachusetts during the next 10 years.

This pent-up demand is due to numerous factors, most important of which are:

1. Massachusetts population increased 641,000 between 1920 and 1945.
2. There has been a sharp increase in the formation of new families in recent years; the marriage rate in 1946 was almost 2½ times as great as in 1934.
3. In 1940, 40 percent of the existing houses had been built prior to 1899, and it is now estimated that 290,000 units are improper for adequate living.
4. It is estimated that over 80,000 families were doubled-up at the end of 1946.
5. Present estimates call for the construction of 35,000 units a year for the next 10 years, while the yearly average between 1929 and 1946 was less than 7,000 units and the peak year, 1925, only produced about 27,000 units.

Contrasted with these various estimates of need, it is estimated that starts in 1947 will not exceed 12,000 units, and that rental units will approximate no more than 10 percent of the total.

It is estimated that a total of 60,000 veterans in Massachusetts (of which 50,000 are in desperate need) are desirous of buying homes or renting new apartments. Sixty-four percent of those desirous of buying are willing to pay no more than \$7,000, while 80 percent of those veterans desirous of renting new quarters can afford no more

than \$50 a month. The failure of the present building program to satisfy these needs is evident in both the comparatively small number of units which are being built, and in the price range at which units are being placed on the market. The market price of the average sale unit is over \$10,000, whereas less than 9 percent of the veterans can afford such a price. A comparison of the percentage range of rental units authorized by the FHA and the expressed needs of the veterans shows even more strikingly the failure to meet veterans' demands, particularly when it is borne in mind that total rental units to be constructed this year will likely equal only 4 percent of the total veterans' demand. The percentage distributions follow:

Per month	Below \$30	\$30 to \$40	\$40 to \$50	\$50 to \$60	Over \$60
Expressed veteran need	Percent 9.2	Percent 35.4	Percent 35.4	Percent 13.7	Percent 5.7
FHA permits, first quarter 1947	.8	3.3	5.1	4.3	86.5

#### TRIBUTES TO SENATOR CAPPER ON HIS EIGHTY-SECOND BIRTHDAY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think it both fitting and proper to pause a moment in our work to pay brief tribute to one of our fellow Senators who is serving his twenty-ninth year as United States Senator, and today celebrates his eighty-second birthday.

I refer, as all Senators know, to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], whose constituents have paid their highest tribute to him by their continued reelection of him to the United States Senate since November 5, 1918.

The widespread knowledge of the details of his career makes it presumptuous of me to do more than mention a few in tribute.

ARTHUR CAPPER, Republican, was born in Garnett, Kans., July 14, 1865, and was educated in the common schools and high schools of Garnett. He started his career in newspaper work and now owns the third largest newspaper and magazine printing establishment in the United States, known as the Capper Publications.

His election to the United States Senate was preceded by 4 years of elective service as Governor of the great State of Kansas.

His initial election to the United States Senate was the start of a career of service to both the people of Kansas and all the people of our country. The Senator from Kansas has always been regarded as the spokesman of farming interests in the Halls of Congress. The Capper-Volstead Act which legalized farm cooperatives is the basis for every farm cooperative today. The Capper-Ketchum Act, under which the 4-H Clubs were organized and now operate, is a tribute to his interest both in agriculture and in the welfare of children.

The Senator from Kansas has repeatedly demonstrated his love for children, the future citizens and leaders of our country, by his acts even more than by his words. At Christmastime 1920 he founded the Capper Fund for Crippled Children which has grown in its service through the years and constitutes one of his principal hobbies.

Years ago he organized the Capper boy and girl clubs in which he goes into personal partnership with each member of the club, the object of which is the building of character and leadership among farm boys and girls.

Mr. President, in regard to the legislative accomplishments of this man of service, it is enough to say "Look at the record." He has always stood for clean politics, and when the final results of any controversy have been announced, he has immediately and without equivocation given his wholehearted support to the expressed will of the majority.

He is more than a man—he is an institution; a fine, wholesome influence in his State and in his Nation. Mr. President, I am sure I express the sentiment of the Members of this august body when I say to him, "Best wishes and a happy birthday."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to add my word to what has been said by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. Since I came to the Senate it has been my privilege to be associated with the Senator from Kansas in working for American agriculture and to consider legislation proposed for the benefit of American agriculture. I want to say that I do not think any man living has done more to promote it and to help the farm people of the United States to live a happier and more prosperous life than has the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think I ought to take advantage of this opportunity to express my appreciation of the tributes paid to the distinguished Senator from Kansas. They are especially appropriate in that they have been paid immediately preceding the taking up by the Senate of the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1948. I want to join my colleagues in paying my deep respect and tribute to the Senator from Kansas, who has long been known as one of the greatest friends of American agriculture.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think I can give an over-all picture of the bill rather briefly. The estimate of the Budget Bureau recommended appropriations of \$1,188,571,318. The bill as passed by the House carried \$847,601,976, or a reduction in the budget estimate of \$340,989,342. The Senate bill as reported to the floor at this moment contains an authorization for appropriations of \$1,048,266,136, or an increase of \$200,664,160 over the bill as it came from the House. The major part of that \$200,000,000 is contained in eight specific items.

The first is the item for conservation and use of agricultural land resources. The committee has increased the appropriation for this item by \$93,000,000, using \$37,000,000 which the Department of Agriculture has as a carry-over from year to year, to be spent in the program for this year. That was the most highly controversial item.

In last year's appropriation bill the Congress authorized a \$300,000,000 program for conservation and use for this year. Based upon that authorization, the Department of Agriculture went forward with its program. When the House considered the appropriation bill, it cut back the appropriation for that item from \$301,000,000 to \$165,000,000, authorizing only \$150,000,000 to be used as payments and \$15,000,000 to be used for administrative purposes. The Senate committee believed it was its duty to follow through with the program which was authorized by both figure and language in the 1947 Appropriation Act, and therefore the committee voted to reinstate the full payments of \$267,500,000, reducing the appropriations for expenses, however, to \$27,500,000, or making a total of \$295,000,000.

Moreover, the House had eliminated any authorization for any program for the ensuing year. The Senate committee voted to revive that program and to authorize a \$150,000,000 program for the fiscal year 1948, but the committee changed the procedure. Believing that the soil-conservation program should be utilized as an incentive, the committee is of the opinion that those who can afford to pay for their own soil-conservation programs in large amounts should be required to do so. So in the authorization for next year the committee has provided that no participant shall receive more than \$500 in payments for participating in this program with the Government of the United States. The present limitation is \$10,000. So the committee has voted to reduce it by \$9,500 to the participants so that more of the smaller participants and those in the lower income groups on the farms may participate and may have the incentive which we believe this program will provide.

The second item was that for the Farmers Home Administration. As to that item, the House eliminated entirely the \$35,000,000 estimated by the Bureau of the Budget for tenant loans. There are a great many veterans as well as other persons, who have applied for loans. But because of the rising cost of land, the President's own concern about it, in calling a special meeting to consider ways and means of stopping the inflationary rise in the cost of land, and believing that many veterans might—unless the administration screens each case carefully—be loaded down with land that will prove to be not beneficial to them, if a time of low prices comes, as we believe it inevitably will, we did not restore the full \$35,000,000 of the Budget Bureau's estimate; nevertheless, by unanimous vote in both the subcommittee and the full committee, we restored \$20,000,000 for the item for loans, and added \$6,000,000 to the item for salaries and administrative expenses, making a total addition of \$26,000,000 over the amounts allowed by the House.

For the Rural Electrification Administration, the appropriation for loans was reduced by the House to \$225,000,000, and the appropriation for administrative expenses was reduced by the House by \$1,600,000. The subcommittee and the full Senate Appropriations Committee restored \$25,000,000 to the appropriation

for loans, making a total of \$250,000,000, and restored \$1,000,000 for the appropriation for administrative expenses; and in the report the committee suggests that this appropriation be devoted to the areas where at the present time there is less opportunity to enjoy the benefits of the REA.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I desire to congratulate the committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], for restoring the cuts made by the House of Representatives in the appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration. I congratulate the committee because I think its action is to be commended, and I think the appropriation as recommended by our committee will prove to be most beneficial.

On page 12 of the report there is a statement which I should like to have clarified at this time. It appears at the top of the page, as follows:

The committee instructs the Administrator of REA to report to both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees in writing 30 days in advance of approving allocations of funds for acquiring or building generating plants.

I can see no objection to that instruction at a time when the Congress is in session, but I should like to ask whether it would apply under certain conditions which I shall describe. For instance, there is an REA system in my own State. At the present time it is purchasing power from one of the corporate power companies. But that company itself is so desperately short of power that it may have to cut off the supply of power to the REA, and it has said so in so many words; and it has also provided in the contract that in the event that it becomes too short of power, it may cut off the supply to the REA.

The REA itself has a small Diesel generating plant which would be totally inadequate to supply its members in case the other source of power is lost. If that source of power is lost, it probably will happen during the coming fall, during the period of low water, when Congress is not in session. In such event it would be almost necessary for the REA cooperative to add to its generating equipment on short notice.

Would the Senator from Illinois expect that this instruction to the REA would hold under such conditions at a time when the Senate was not in session, or would a notice to the committee clerk that a loan was to be made for the purpose of the installation of the generating equipment suffice, even though the Senate were not in session?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I speak only for myself. I wish to tell the Senator from Vermont that there was considerable feeling that something on the subject should be written into the law, and offer was made of an amendment which would prohibit the REA from building or acquiring any generating plants without first going to the State authority, after the determination had been made as to the necessity of supplying additional power at a reasonable rate. The committee felt that such a



provision should not be placed in the bill, but that we would have a better understanding of how far the REA was to go, and would have a chance of being notified of any acquisition or building of a generating plant, by requiring that 30 days' notice be given by them.

If the REA in the Senator's State can foresee such a situation, I think it should report it 30 days in advance. Certainly it can foresee 30 days in advance what its problem is going to be.

In view of the shortage of generating equipment, which is one of the bottle-necks all over the United States, we did not provide that they could not do it, but we simply say that we wish to be notified 30 days before they do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the purpose, and I do not disagree with it. I was simply bringing up the possibility that an emergency might arise. For instance, we lost a substantial source of power in Vermont, the other day, when a dam burst. That power is very badly needed. The bursting of that dam will make our very short supply of power still shorter.

In the event of the occurrence of such an emergency, when it is necessary to get power somewhere very quickly, is it the opinion of the Senator from Illinois that the committee would have objection to the installation of such generating equipment, even though the Congress was not in session; and would a notice to the committee clerk, who will be in Washington, we assume, meet the requirements of this instruction of the committee?

Mr. BROOKS. I think a notice to the clerk, addressed to the chairman of the committee, will be adequate notice. It is not stated that it has to be delivered in hand. There will be somebody here, and he can be notified. It is merely for the purpose of having a better understanding, and some notice, of when they are going to build generating plants. I think the provision could hardly be more liberal.

Mr. AIKEN. Notice to the clerk of the committee would suffice?

Mr. BROOKS. Notice addressed to the chairman.

Mr. AIKEN. I am satisfied with the statement of the Senator from Illinois. I am speaking of a very possible emergency which may occur in my State, and it would have to be met in some way.

Mr. BROOKS. The next item, Mr. President, relates to the school-lunch program. Last year the Federal Government provided \$81,000,000 toward this program. The Budget Bureau's estimate this year was \$75,000,000. The House reduced it to \$45,000,000, and eliminated the possibility of the practice which has been followed in the past, of considering the money that is paid in by school children for their lunch as a part of the matching fund. The Senate committee has restored the full \$75,000,000, and deleted the restriction against the use of the payments by the children for their lunches as a part of the matching fund. We did suggest, in our report, however, that we felt that the States might move faster in assuming their rightful share in caring for this program.

The House pointed out that almost every State government today has a very large surplus, while the Federal Government is operating under a deficit of \$257,000,000,000. I might say that it was my purpose, as the chairman of the subcommittee, to suggest to various witnesses who came before us, parent-teacher associations and others, that they use diligence, and all their influence, to try to impress on local government—county, city, and State—that they should assume a large proportion of this very beneficial program. Because only 22 States had by legislative authority authorized or appropriated money for this purpose, and 26 States had not, we felt that the program should be continued. I might say, further, that in my own State more than a year ago I urged the chief advocates of the program to go to the State government, which they did, and they received a larger appropriation than they ever received before.

I believe the program is a beneficial one, but I think we should take account of the fiscal condition of the Federal Government. As was pointed out in the debate in the House, we are giving billions of dollars to feed the children of Europe; and it was made plain that that is a responsibility which falls on the Federal Treasury, and that a larger proportion of this program should be assumed by the local governments.

The next item is section 32 funds. The House allowed only \$40,000,000; the Senate committee increased the amount to \$48,000,000 which will, we are told by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, meet any foreseeable problem in meeting the obligations for the purpose for which section 32 funds were originally set aside, and with the \$8,000,000 additional, they will be given 4 percent of the \$48,000,000, which will give them an adequate fund for the administration of the agricultural marketing program.

Another item of \$6,140,000 pertains to meat inspection. The House provided \$5,000,000, and suggested that it be a revolving fund, that the packers from now on should pay all the costs, by fee, of meat inspection. There was much objection to that in the Senate committee, on the ground that meat inspection is a public health measure. It was provided for by law with that in mind. Seventy-five percent of the meat of the country today which is slaughtered is federally inspected. That percentage has grown during the war, but a great many more packing plants have come in under meat inspection. Six hundred and fifty were participating before the war, and 900 are now participating, showing that a greater number of plants have come in, and therefore, with the feeling that the meat inspection might be done away with, or avoided, by different packing companies, thereby endangering the health of the country, if the cost were imposed as a fee, and that the expense would be put back on the consumer, the amount of \$6,140,000 was restored.

The next item is Federal crop insurance. The House reduced the amount from \$9,000,000 and a little more to \$1,000,000. Since that time the Senate has passed a bill, whose author is the Sena-

tor from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and in the House there have been hearings on a similar bill. We have increased the amount by four or five million dollars, and put the crop insurance on an experimental basis.

With the million dollars allowed by the House, the Department would not be able even to collect the premiums this year. There are some 540,000 contracts in force now, some fifty-one or fifty-two millions in premiums outstanding, with a possible insurable loss of \$500,000,000. We felt that adequate funds should be provided to service those loans, to collect those premiums, to service the losses as they were reported, and to place the new Federal crop insurance project on a strictly experimental stage, so that it might become a sound program, and then extend it on that basis.

The other amount of \$4,000,000 that was restored was in the item of forest roads and trails.

With this explanation, Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order has already been made. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], chairman of the subcommittee in charge of agricultural appropriations, for his great service to agriculture. I think his understanding of and sympathy with agricultural problems merit commendation. His tolerance and patience through many days of hearings are to be commended also. The chairman's job was not an easy one. It was his difficult task to reconcile and bring together those on the committee who favored curtailed appropriations for farm programs and those, like myself, whose business has always been farming, who strongly favored strong and adequately financed farm programs. I think he did a very excellent job indeed.

I am very happy at the result of the hearings in the subcommittee. I believe they represent great gains for agriculture, which would have been lost if the House action had been allowed to stand.

At this point in my remarks I ask to have inserted in the RECORD Wayne Darrow's Washington Farm Letter, which gives a very good review of agricultural appropriations as set forth in the committee bill now before the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### APPROPRIATIONS

The more-liberal-than-the-House farm appropriations bill reported today by Senate Appropriations Committee will clear the Senate late next week with little change.

Senator Brooks, Republican, of Illinois, chairman of farm subcommittee, has made as sure as he can that no floor amendments will be pushed, and that many House GOP Members will go along when bill gets there. Young, Republican, North Dakota, led fight in committee for restorations, helped by RUSSELL, Democrat, Georgia.

TABER, Republican, New York, and DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, will put up a fight to keep many of the original cuts when bill comes back to House. Our check-up indi-

cates they will lose more than they will win, and that final bill will be much nearer Senate than House bill.

Here are high lights of Senate bill, compared to House:

AAA: Full conservation payment funds for 1947, or \$130,000,000 over House figure, and \$27,500,000 for administration (nearly twice what House allowed); \$150,000,000 for 1948, with limit of \$500 on individual payments, and allocations to States on basis of conservation needs except no State can be reduced more than 15 percent below the 1946 distribution.

SCS: Soil conservation research funds restored to full budget request by adding \$750,000 to House allowance.

FHA: Tenant-purchase loans of \$20,000,000, with priority recommended for veterans; \$6,000,000 more administrative funds. This is \$20,000,000 more than allowed by the House.

School lunches: Full \$75,000,000 restored, to come from section 32 funds (tariff revenues), and prohibition removed against use of school-children payments as offsets to Federal funds. This is \$30,000,000 more than the House figure.

Section 32 funds: Upped from \$40,000,000 allowed by House to \$48,000,000 for surplus purchases, and \$75,000,000 for lunches.

REA: Full \$250,000,000 loan power restored and \$1,000,000 replaced in administrative funds. Empty provision: Senate and House Appropriations Committees must be notified 30 days in advance of any generating-plant expansion.

Market research: Hope-Flannagan funds upped from \$9,000,000 to \$9,500,000, with suggestion USDA set up separate unit to handle. Meat inspection: Full funds restored—packers not to pay cost.

Crop insurance raised from \$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000. EAE got \$500,000 restored for economic investigations. Home economics cut \$245,000 below House. Solicitor's office had \$200,000 restored.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to touch on one or two of the accomplishments of the Senate committee. One is the restoration of the PMA conservation and land-use program for next year. In my opinion that is the major accomplishment of our committee's work. In fact, I cannot see how any future agricultural program can be written and made effective without the machinery provided by the committee system now in use under the present conservation and land-use program. There must be a farmer-committee system functioning if any sound agricultural program is to be really effective.

In my opinion, it would have been desirable to provide for the 1948 program on a scale larger than the \$150,000,000 program set forth here; but in the interests of economy there was some justification for this reduction and a substantial program can still be carried forward under this figure.

Another great and important accomplishment was the restoration of the section 32 funds, which are badly needed in the support of farm prices. It should be noted that the committee restored \$8,000,000 in section 32 funds for the support of farm prices and otherwise fully provided for farm-support prices.

The restoration of \$25,000,000 in REA loan funds is very important to many areas of the United States, and particularly in my State which now has the lowest percentage of electrified farms of all the States of the Nation.

It was absolutely necessary that crop insurance administration funds be re-

stored if this program is to operate successfully. There are some appropriations in which I would rather have seen larger restorations than are made in this bill, but I believe that the committee action, as a whole, is very favorable. I hope the Senate will adopt the action of the committee without major amendment.

I had been hopeful of a larger raise in loan funds for the Farmers Home Administration, which gives valuable service to farmers generally and particularly to farmer veterans. However, the \$20,000,000 increase granted by the committee will be very helpful, as will the substantial increase in administrative funds.

The restoration of \$25,000,000 in REA loan funds also was a commendable action on the part of the committee, although I would have preferred a larger restoration of funds for REA administrative needs than the \$1,000,000 allowed.

There is one further amendment to which I would like to refer very briefly. In restoring the conservation and land-use program for next year on a basis of \$150,000,000, an amendment was adopted placing this program on a basis of need. The ceiling limiting to \$10,000 the maximum payment which can be made to any one farmer under the present program was changed so that the ceiling will be \$500 under the 1948 program. On the over-all picture for the United States there would be no material change in the amount of money going to the various States as a result of this amendment, with the exception of three or four States. Kansas, under a \$300,000,000 program, would have had its funds under this program reduced from approximately \$10,000,000 to \$5,000,000. North Dakota's share would have been reduced from \$7,726,000 to \$3,753,000. The amendment that I offered to the committee, which was accepted, prohibits a change of more than 15 percent from last year's figures. The effect of this amendment of mine is to prevent a loss of \$2,809,000 to North Dakota farmers in payments under this year's program and a possible loss of \$1,404,550 to them under next year's program as set forth in this bill. This, I believe, makes the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), to make grants on the basis of need, workable, and will make possible a good program for next year, even with the more limited funds. I hope that the final action on these agricultural appropriations will remain substantially as left by our committee. The important place agriculture occupies in our national economy makes absolutely necessary all of these funds if we are to prevent another bankrupt agriculture such as that which followed the last war.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before the vote on the amendments, I would like to say just a word. The subject of American agriculture is very close to my heart, and I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the junior Senator from Illinois and the members of his subcommittee on the very excellent work they have done in connection with this bill. I consider it perfectly fair and generous treatment of American agriculture. I

want to express my appreciation to the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Brooks) for his excellent leadership on the Agriculture appropriation bill.

Now that this seems to be a day of compliments and congratulations, Senators having just now congratulated one of our colleagues on his birthday after 30 years of service in this body, I wish to say a word about the work of one of our colleagues who has been here only a comparatively short time. I refer to the junior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Young). I have been associated with him since he has been here. I want to say that his work on the Committee on Agriculture, as well as on the Committee on Appropriations, has been most outstanding. He has been diligent in his attendance at committee hearings. He has studied the bills thoroughly, and he has been fair not only to agriculture but to all other groups of people as well. I know of no one who has made a greater contribution to constructive agricultural legislation in so short a time as has Senator Young. I am glad to take this opportunity to say what I think about his work.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to take a brief moment to express my gratitude to the Committee on Agriculture for the improvements they have made in the situation confronting the agricultural appropriation bill. I was very much discouraged, I will say frankly, when the House of Representatives, for whom I have the highest respect, having served in it for a long time, got through with the agricultural appropriation bill, especially in view of what it did to the Rural Electrification Administration, soil conservation, the Farmers Home Administration, and certain other items of the appropriation bill. I naturally am interested especially in those items which are the basis of our improved agricultural situation, because I was here when the original legislation providing for them was enacted and when we set out to try to stop the ravages of soil erosion in the United States, which takes millions of acres of rich surface soil down our creeks and rivers, and into the oceans and gulfs every year. I have always felt, and I am sure every other Senator will agree, that as our population increases, every acre of land must support more people than it did before. We cannot allow our soil to become wasted. We must not only retain its fertility but we must reclaim large areas which in the early days were allowed to go to waste because it was not needed. So it is encouraging to see the Senate committee restore substantially the funds which we felt were absolutely indispensable to carry on the soil-conservation program.

The same thing applies to the REA. We know that under its administration of the funds loaned to it, millions of our farmers, farmers' wives, and children have had lifted from their backs the drudgery of hard hand labor. It is one of the things in which the States and local communities could not indulge. It had to come through the loaning power of the Federal Government. It could not have been done even by commercial banks and lending agencies. In that view of that important situation, which has found encouragement in all States



of the Union by the formation of REA cooperatives and by improved conditions in all the homes in the country, although they are not yet all electrified, the increase since the inauguration of the program has justified the effort on the part of the Federal Government, in my judgment, and I think it has met with the general approval of the people, especially of the farmers throughout the country.

In regard to the Farmers Home Administration, which was originally known as the Resettlement Administration and then the Farm Security Administration, I believe all Senators recognize that the object was to make it possible for more American farmers to own their own homes, to hold out encouragement and assistance to tenant farmers to become land owners and home owners. We know that the larger the proportion of our farmers who own their homes, the greater the number of farmers who have a stake in the soil which they cultivate, the more stable our institutions will be. Foreign ideologies and nostrums find little welcome and little fertility in the soil of farmers who own their land and their homes, and who cultivate their own land. It is the hopelessness and despair of the tenant who, looking down the dim corridors of the future, can see no chance of owning his own farm and his own home, that offers opportunity for instability and insecurity, which is the feeding ground of foreign nostrums of which we speak so much in this day.

I want to express my own appreciation to the committee for improving the situation so far as the appropriation is concerned. I hope the increases that have been provided in the bill will be retained when the bill goes to conference. I want to thank all the members of the committee for the assistance they have rendered in that respect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Penalty mail," on page 4, line 4, after "(39 U. S. C. 321d)", to strike out "\$3,186,000" and insert "\$3,486,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Research and Marketing Act of 1946," on page 4, line 19, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$2,500,000"; in line 20, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be transferred to and make a part of the appropriation 'Research on agricultural problems of Alaska,' without matching requirement"; and in line 23, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That section 11 of said Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended by said act of August 14, 1946, is amended by striking out 'authorized to be appropriated under section 9 (a)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'appropriated pursuant to section 9 (a).'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 14, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$2,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 15, after the words "In all", to strike out "\$9,000,000" and insert "\$9,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of the Solicitor," on page 6, line 9, after the word "service", to strike out "\$2,025,000" and insert "\$2,225,000", and in line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,597,000" and insert "\$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Information—Printing and binding," on page 10, line 20, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608C 608d), such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection therewith" and insert "to carry into effect the terms of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under section 32"; and on page 11, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$95,300" and insert "\$170,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 11, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,887,000" and insert "\$2,387,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 8, after the word "trends", to strike out "\$1,743,600" and insert "\$2,243,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Agricultural Research Administration—Research on agricultural problems of Alaska," on page 18, after line 9, to strike out:

To enable the Secretary, through such officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Territory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska \$144,940, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and with other public and private agencies. The provisions of this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of the enactment hereof, and the Secretary is authorized to take such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities hereunder. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than any land in general use heretofore for other university purposes, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable continue the employment of the existing personnel of the station. Notwith-

standing any other provision of law, including the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended balances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the legislature or acquired under authority of law for the construction, use, and development of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, the availability of such funds to be unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secretary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the transfer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to strike out:

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS  
PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related acts: Hatch Act, the act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377, 379), \$720,000; Adams Act, the act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), \$720,000; Purnell Act, the act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373, 376, 380, 382), \$2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427g), \$2,661,268, none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386-386b), extending the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, \$90,000; Puerto Rico, the act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d-386f), extending the benefits of certain acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, \$90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, \$7,161,268.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361-363, 365-369, 370-383, 386, 386d-386f); relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, \$211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 14, to insert:

To enable the Secretary, through such agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, \$100,000, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, the acquisition of land and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law, including the construction of such buildings and facilities upon land provided by the Territory or otherwise.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 22, to insert:

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS  
PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND  
PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377-379), \$720,000; Adams Act, the act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), \$720,000; Purnell Act, the act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C., 361, 366, 370, 371, 373-376, 380, 382), \$2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), \$2,663,708; Hawaii, the act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 383-386b), extending the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, \$90,000; Alaska, the act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 366c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, \$15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 363a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, \$27,500; in all, for Alaska, \$42,500; Puerto Rico, the act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d-386f), extending the benefits of certain acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, \$90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, \$7,206,208.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20 1936 and acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361-363, 365-383, 386-386f), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, \$211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 24, line 4, before the word "for," to strike out "\$1,059,000" and insert "\$1,061,840."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 7, after the word "products", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$11,140,000"; and in line 7, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as a working capital fund, without fiscal year limitation, to be designated as the 'Meat inspection fund,' which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished inspection or service under said laws, including inspection of meat and meat food products offered for import or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse meat products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and at

rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be deposited in the meat inspection fund, shall provide full reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific and technical investigations and laboratory services; investigations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; supervisory, administrative, statistical, business management, and other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized by the act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431); and other necessary expenses: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the interests of the United States, and may withhold or withdraw such inspection or service for non-payment of charges or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of payment: *Provided further*, That inspection or other technical services may be rendered to Government and other public agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein provided: *Provided further*, That a schedule of obligations and reimbursements of the meat inspection fund, as of the close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided further*, That payments shall be made for inspection or service rendered on and after July 1, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 5, after the word "animals", to strike out "\$290,000" and insert "\$340,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Dairy Industry", on page 29, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$540,912."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering—Salaries and expenses", on page 31, line 20, after the word "control", to strike out "\$359,280" and insert "\$379,280."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 6, after the word "management", to strike out "\$1,391,000" and insert "\$1,491,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and expenses", on page 34, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$692,000" and insert "\$709,440."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 14, after the numerals "166", to strike out "\$2,697,100" and insert "\$3,047,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Human Nutrition

and Home Economics", on page 39, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$381,700" and insert "\$305,000", and in line 24, after the word "subject", to strike out "\$1,045,000" and insert "\$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest Service—Salaries and expenses", on page 40, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,055,378" and insert "\$1,083,378."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 6, after the word "forests", to strike out "\$23,764,891" and insert "\$24,014,891."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 3, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 8, after "section 10", to strike out "\$572,000" and insert "\$822,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of lands for national forests," on page 46, line 19, after the numerals "521", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$750,000"; in line 20, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired"; and in line 21, after the amendment last above stated, to insert a semicolon and "the administrative cost of such acquisition to be met from the appropriation 'National Forest Protection and Management'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest roads and trails," on page 47, line 25, after "(1)", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$11,000,000"; in line 26, after "(2)", to strike out "\$5,300,000" and insert "\$8,300,000"; on page 48, line 3, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$15,300,000" and insert "\$19,300,000"; and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$109,530."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Flood control," on page 48, line 23, after the word "improvement", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$1,500,000"; on page 49, line 5, after the word "situated", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 12, after the amendment just above stated, insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That \$1,000,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used to make preliminary examinations and surveys in the watersheds of the upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries."

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, under the heading "Soil Conservation Service," on page 49, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$838,500" and insert "\$875,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 5, after the word "installations", to strike out "\$673,000" and insert "\$1,423,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Production and Marketing Administration—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," on page 52, after line 4, to strike out:

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 71, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281-1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; \$165,614,290, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,000,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but not more than \$1,950,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation or administration of any 1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to marketing quotas under the latter act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices

approved by the Secretary in the 1947 program under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, §385)) within 1 year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels: *Provided further*, That where farmer participation in the program in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have not been sufficient to meet such requirements.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281-1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; \$258,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 26, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$27,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including the peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be

charged to such limitation; but not more than \$7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order No. 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to \$150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 percent from the 1946 distribution and that no participant shall receive more than \$500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947, 1948, and 1949 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or

the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1385) within 1 year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *And provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 2, to strike out:

#### NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), \$45,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 8, to strike out:

#### ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c-608d), including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$525,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marketing services," on page 61, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,211,000" and insert "\$2,286,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 1, after the word "products", to insert "(including broilers)"; and in line 3, after the word "products", to strike out "\$1,527,500" and insert "\$1,566,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 13, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commodity Exchange Authority," on page 66, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$141,000" and insert "\$153,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Farmers Home Administration," on page 66, line 22, after the word "Loans", to strike out "For loans under" and insert "Title I and section 43, \$20,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 8, after the numerals "1946", to

strike out "\$18,000,000" and insert "\$24,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration," on page 69, line 17, after the word "reports", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 20, after the word "thereof", to strike out "\$225,000,000" and insert "\$250,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," on page 78, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 8. Limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in this act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the act of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 14, to change the section number from 8 to 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Government corporations," on page 78, line 22, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 11, after the word "flax", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948 or subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed 633 counties and flax in not to exceed 87 counties, in accordance with section 508 (a) (1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five additional crops in 1948 under the provisions of section 508 (a) (2) of said act, as amended, including corn and tobacco in not to exceed 50 counties each and cotton in not to exceed 56 counties, unless otherwise provided by legislation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Reduction in appropriation—Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities," on page 81, line 7, after the word "than", to strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$48,000,000"; and in line 9, after the word "act", to insert "To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), there is hereby made available \$75,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), such amount to be without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. Are there further amendments to be offered?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment on page 34, line 3, was agreed to; so I may offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROOKS. I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 34, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "\$709,440" and insert in lieu thereof "\$758,688."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for myself, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "\$428,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$578,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, after conferring with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], my colleague the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], it was the understanding that the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from North Carolina, and I would join in the amendment, which we are glad to do.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to say that the amendment which I offered and sent to the desk carries on its face the names of the senior Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and myself. I wish the clerk would read the amendment, including the sponsors.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to associate myself in the offering of the amendment, and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], with whom we have discussed this matter, desire to be associated with it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the wording of the amendment as it was sent to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The wording of the amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. UMSTEAD) to the bill H. R. 3601, viz, on page 13, line 13, strike out "\$428,000" and insert in its place "\$578,000."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me explanatory of the amendment just offered.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the



distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], in the amendment to increase the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations by \$150,000, from \$428,000 to \$578,000.

The proposed reduction in funds of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations would have required the Department of Agriculture to surrender to the State Department the vital job of protecting American farmers' interests in the forthcoming battle for our fair share of agricultural exports. This is the very thing the House Appropriations Committee said it wanted to prevent.

Practically every foreign government now imposes controls over trade which restrict the chances of American producers to export their surplus farm products. The best way to remedy this situation is to bargain directly with other countries and to negotiate in international conferences and international organizations. American farmers need an export market.

If this section of the Department of Agriculture is made weaker, the State Department must step in to fill the vacuum. Farmers prefer to be represented through their own Department. Farmers want representation which knows the facts on the world agricultural situation, and the domestic agricultural situation. It is the only kind of representation which can be effective.

Furthermore, it is necessary that farmers, farm organizations, and farm leaders have the facts about competitive production and about market opportunities and market conditions abroad. They want those facts made available to them through our Department of Agriculture.

The proposed reduction in funds for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations will cripple these vital services to American agriculture at the very time when they are most needed.

If this cut is sustained, the Department of Agriculture will no longer be able to provide experienced men to represent farm interests in these international negotiations, now more important than ever before.

Furthermore, such representation as will remain will not have at its command the detailed facts on the agriculture of other countries and the analyses of the world agricultural situation which are essential to success in the job of protecting American farmers' interests.

And just as important, American farmers, agricultural producers' organizations, and American exporters will not have the information which they need, in the form of summarized reports and analyses of production, competition, and market opportunities abroad.

This is particularly true for my own State of Kentucky, whose chief crop in value is tobacco. Export outlets are absolutely necessary for tobacco producers. Already the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations has performed notable service in finding new markets for Kentucky tobacco, and it looks forward to increased aid and service on its part to the farmers of the Nation.

**THE PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

**MR. BARKLEY.** Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the body of the Record at this point a brief memorandum of two pages with reference to the services of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations to the producers of tobacco throughout the United States in undertaking to facilitate the securing of foreign markets for this particular agricultural product throughout the world, wherever they are available.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### DIRECT SERVICES TO TOBACCO GROWERS AND EXPORTERS

The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations renders many services, direct and indirect, to tobacco growers and exporters. Three instances will illustrate: the Czechoslovakian loan for the purchase of American tobacco, the Italian loan for the purchase of American tobacco, and the issuance of licenses for importation of American tobacco into China.

#### THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN LOAN FOR THE PURCHASE OF UNITED STATES LEAF TOBACCO

Reports from the American Embassy, Praha, Czechoslovakia, indicated that the tobacco monopoly of that country wished to purchase American leaf tobacco for the manufacture of American-type blended cigarettes and other products. The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations supplied information regarding our tobacco to the Czechoslovak Embassy which led to a loan by the Export-Import Bank to the Czechoslovak Government of \$2,000,000 in September 1946. Since that time we have shipped to Czechoslovakia more than 4,000,000 pounds of tobacco made up as follows: Burley 1,534,000 pounds, flue-cured 1,938,000 pounds, Virginia fire-cured 559,000 pounds, and cigar 52,000 pounds. This is the largest amount of tobacco ever shipped to that country in 1 year. But for the recent unfortunate circumstances, a profitable market would have been established for American tobacco in Czechoslovakia. It may yet result if conditions again become favorable to trade relations with that country.

#### THE ITALIAN LOAN FOR THE PURCHASE OF UNITED STATES LEAF TOBACCO

Report No. 312 of November 30, 1945, from the American Embassy at Rome gave a concise statement of the tobacco situation in Italy. It was noted that stocks of leaf tobacco on June 30, 1945, amounted to only 44,600,000 pounds as compared with 244,500,000 pounds on the same date in 1939. This indicated a serious shortage of tobacco and the need for additional supplies. The United States at one time had supplied Italy with the bulk of its requirements and it was thought that the situation might lead to the reestablishment of trade with that country.

The Office arranged for a conference with the commercial counselor of the Italian Embassy and the situation was discussed. It was found that the Italian Monopoly wished to purchase tobacco in this country but had insufficient dollars for this purpose. After several conferences between officials of the Embassy and this office, the Italian tobacco monopoly decided to apply to the Export-Import Bank for a loan to purchase tobacco. At this point it was thought best to place further negotiations in the hands of the trade, and a conference was arranged for the Export Committee of the Tobacco Association of the United States to discuss the matter with officials of the Italian Embassy. The conference took place on July 12, 1946, and there were several subsequent conferences. The final result was a loan by the Export-Import Bank of \$5,000,000 to the Italian tobacco monopoly for the purchase of American tobacco.

Through May of this year we had exported to Italy 7,632,000 pounds of tobacco made up as follows: Burley 5,528,000 pounds, fire-cured 1,471,000 pounds, flue-cured 630,000 pounds, and black fat (a processed tobacco) 3,287 pounds. The tobacco trade between the United States and Italy was thereby reestablished, and it is expected that Italy will continue to be a market of importance for our tobacco.

#### THE CHINESE SITUATION

The Chinese Government was, and still is, short of dollar exchange when hostilities

with Japan ceased. The Government of China decided that certain goods and commodities, absolute essentials, could be imported freely; certain others, nonessentials and luxuries, were prohibited; and a third class, including leaf tobacco, could be imported only by permit and that permits would be allocated.

This action by the Chinese Government was condemned both by flue-cured tobacco growers and exporters. They passed several strongly worded resolutions and wrote letters of protest to Members of Congress. This office was requested to call a conference of growers and exporters to discuss the situation. A conference was called by a farm organization (North Carolina State Grange) for April 17, 1946.

The situation in China was explained as regards both the financial situation and the basis to be used in allocating licenses for the imports of leaf tobacco. Tobacco growers and exporters were advised to wait until licenses were allocated before taking any definite action, as until licenses were issued there was no basis for a protest. They agreed to this procedure, but drafted resolutions which were forwarded to the Department of State. That Department cabled the United States officials in China certain views expressed in the resolutions sent to the State Department.

On June 13, 1947, the Department of State received from Shanghai, China, a cable which stated:

"All American dealers leaf tobacco here have received authorization to import quantities and values of American leaf tobacco as applied for covering March-September, 7 months' period."

It, therefore, paid to wait out the situation rather than lodge formal complaint before we had full information. Exports to China in 1946 amounted to 72,900,000 pounds.

The statement has been made that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is tied too closely to the Department of State. The instances cited indicate that close cooperation between the two agencies is desirable.

**MR. SALTONSTALL.** Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 6, to strike out the proviso which reads:

*Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof.*

I will say very briefly that this provision, which was put into the appropriation bill this year, would eliminate the opportunity to carry out the purposes of the act of 1946 to treat fish and shellfish as agricultural products in connection with transportation rates, and matters of that kind. There is no money involved. The striking out of the language would simply allow the Department of Agriculture to include fish and shellfish as agricultural products in connection with rates on the railroads and similar matters. I hope the Senator from Illinois will be able to accept the amendment.

**MR. BROOKS.** Mr. President, we had no testimony on this item. It was not mentioned, and we did not know there would be any controversy about it. I will accept the amendment, with the understanding that it has to do only with giving fish and shellfish the benefit of freight rates. If however it will include fish and shellfish as a part of the program for support prices for agriculture, I shall certainly object, if I find that to be a fact in conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not understand that to be the situation, and if there is anything of that character, I agree with the statement of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3601) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, we have just passed an appropriation bill containing appropriations which exceed those of last year by a little more than \$20,000,000. I shall not make any extended remarks at this time. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of tables which show the distribution of some of these funds during the past 12 months.

The first is a table which shows the distribution by States in connection with the wool program. This chart is based upon a loss of 10 cents a pound, which was estimated by the Department of Agriculture. It shows how much each State will contribute toward the payment of this bill, and also how much each State will receive. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Re Senate bill 814, to provide support for wool, to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes, based on loss of 10 cents per pound*

State	Proportional part of—	
	Amount to be paid	Amount to be received
Alabama.....	\$188,800	\$11,300
Arizona.....	60,800	352,100
Arkansas.....	80,000	35,600
California.....	2,662,400	2,040,800
Colorado.....	192,000	1,337,200
Connecticut.....	553,600	3,600
Delaware.....	316,800	1,300
Florida.....	310,400	6,100
Georgia.....	320,000	6,000
Idaho.....	48,000	1,182,500
Illinois.....	2,800,000	518,900
Indiana.....	723,200	364,800
Iowa.....	252,800	855,700
Kansas.....	307,200	513,100
Kentucky.....	560,000	434,200
Louisiana.....	272,000	71,900
Maine.....	105,600	20,500

*Re Senate bill 814, to provide support for wool, to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes, based on loss of 10 cents per pound—Continued*

State	Proportional part of—	
	Amount to be paid	Amount to be received
Maryland.....	\$569,600	\$28,100
Massachusetts.....	1,145,600	4,200
Michigan.....	1,555,200	500,100
Minnesota.....	473,600	701,500
Mississippi.....	73,600	19,400
Missouri.....	860,800	861,900
Montana.....	48,000	2,395,800
Nebraska.....	220,800	272,400
Nevada.....	28,800	454,000
New Hampshire.....	60,800	4,800
New Jersey.....	1,004,800	3,400
New Mexico.....	35,200	1,379,700
New York.....	6,412,800	170,400
North Carolina.....	864,000	22,400
North Dakota.....	35,200	622,600
Ohio.....	1,044,800	1,195,600
Oklahoma.....	230,400	185,100
Oregon.....	217,600	838,700
Pennsylvania.....	2,531,200	209,500
Rhode Island.....	179,200	1,200
South Carolina.....	144,000	2,000
South Dakota.....	35,200	1,108,700
Tennessee.....	256,000	179,000
Texas.....	848,000	7,915,100
Utah.....	64,000	1,790,100
Vermont.....	35,200	10,200
Virginia.....	595,200	153,500
Washington.....	428,800	343,800
West Virginia.....	153,600	166,800
Wisconsin.....	665,000	242,600
Wyoming.....	26,000	2,563,100
Total.....	31,596,800	32,101,700

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I also have a table showing the distribution in connection with the school-lunch program, of the \$55,000,000 which was distributed among the States last year. This table is broken down by States. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Re Public Law 396, 79th Cong., school-lunch program—Table showing the amount contributed by each State toward the school-lunch program (according to Federal income-tax percentages), and the amount apportioned to each State by the Federal Government for this program, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1946*

State	Proportional part of—		Increase or decrease
	Amount paid	Amount received	
Alabama.....	\$324,500	\$1,996,954	Increase.
Arizona.....	104,500	309,976	Do.
Arkansas.....	137,500	1,361,384	Do.
California.....	4,576,000	2,182,698	Decrease.
Colorado.....	330,000	381,089	Increase.
Connecticut.....	951,500	327,070	Decrease.
Delaware.....	544,500	207,700	Do.
Florida.....	635,500	1,203,813	Increase.
Georgia.....	550,000	2,787,875	Do.
Idaho.....	82,500	279,219	Do.
Illinois.....	4,812,500	2,713,692	Decrease.
Indiana.....	1,243,000	1,173,258	Do.
Iowa.....	434,500	855,413	Increase.
Kansas.....	528,000	641,786	Do.
Kentucky.....	962,500	1,385,763	Do.
Louisiana.....	467,500	1,872,104	Do.
Maine.....	181,500	260,476	Do.
Maryland.....	979,000	364,851	Decrease.
Massachusetts.....	1,969,000	1,099,187	Do.
Michigan.....	2,673,000	1,658,016	Do.
Minnesota.....	814,000	1,185,193	Increase.
Mississippi.....	126,500	1,240,235	Do.
Missouri.....	1,479,500	1,641,796	Do.
Montana.....	82,500	193,237	Do.
Nebraska.....	379,500	256,318	Decrease.
Nevada.....	49,500	60,625	Increase.
New Hampshire.....	104,500	116,791	Do.
New Jersey.....	1,727,000	986,189	Decrease.
New Mexico.....	60,500	271,872	Increase.

*Re Public Law 396, 79th Cong., school-lunch program—Continued*

State	Proportional part of—		Increase or decrease
	Amount paid	Amount received	
New York.....	\$11,022,000	\$4,018,877	Decrease.
North Carolina.....	1,485,000	2,957,399	Increase.
North Dakota.....	60,500	169,220	Do.
Ohio.....	3,514,500	2,269,988	Decrease.
Oklahoma.....	336,000	1,413,010	Increase.
Oregon.....	374,000	484,864	Do.
Pennsylvania.....	4,850,500	1,158,441	Decrease.
Rhode Island.....	308,000	202,217	Do.
South Carolina.....	247,500	2,128,789	Increase.
South Dakota.....	60,500	188,510	Do.
Tennessee.....	440,000	2,241,273	Do.
Texas.....	1,457,500	5,544,115	Do.
Utah.....	110,000	353,268	Do.
Vermont.....	60,500	128,291	Do.
Virginia.....	1,023,000	1,216,214	Do.
Washington.....	737,000	830,383	Do.
West Virginia.....	264,000	1,117,664	Do.
Wisconsin.....	1,144,000	956,942	Decrease.
Wyoming.....	44,000	180,932	Increase.
Total.....	54,307,000	54,388,677	

NOTE.—The round figure of \$55,000,000 was used to compute the figures in column 1. Column 1 would equal this \$55,000,000 if the District of Columbia tax percentage was included.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also have a table showing the distribution of the agricultural conservation payments by States. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Re agricultural conservation program (payments)—Appropriation: Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, fiscal year 1946—Table showing amount of each State's contribution to the subject appropriation (according to Federal income-tax percentages) and the amount of payments received by each State under subject appropriation*

State	Proportional part of—		Increase or decrease
	Amount contributed	Amount received	
Alabama.....	\$1,495,785	\$4,538,000	+\$3,042,215
Arizona.....	481,693	1,283,000	+801,307
Arkansas.....	633,807	4,065,000	+3,431,193
California.....	21,093,113	8,340,000	-12,753,113
Colorado.....	1,521,138	4,495,000	+2,973,862
Connecticut.....	4,385,947	511,000	-3,874,947
Delaware.....	2,509,877	637,000	-1,872,877
Florida.....	2,459,173	2,093,000	-366,173
Georgia.....	2,535,290	4,442,000	+1,906,710
Idaho.....	580,284	2,322,000	+1,741,716
Illinois.....	22,183,262	10,745,000	-11,438,262
Indiana.....	5,729,619	6,683,000	+953,381
Iowa.....	2,002,831	14,626,000	+12,623,169
Kansas.....	2,433,820	7,967,000	+5,533,180
Kentucky.....	4,436,652	9,944,000	+5,507,348
Louisiana.....	2,154,945	2,640,000	+485,055
Maine.....	836,625	883,000	+46,375
Maryland.....	4,512,709	2,100,000	-2,412,709
Massachusetts.....	9,076,123	784,000	-8,292,123
Michigan.....	12,321,217	6,550,000	-5,771,217
Minnesota.....	3,752,140	14,328,000	+10,575,860
Mississippi.....	583,102	5,082,000	+4,498,898
Missouri.....	6,819,768	9,144,000	+2,324,232
Montana.....	580,284	6,249,000	+5,668,716
Nebraska.....	1,749,308	7,719,000	+5,969,692
Nevada.....	228,170	324,000	+95,830
New Hampshire.....	481,693	339,000	-142,693
New Jersey.....	7,660,622	1,279,000	-6,381,622
New Mexico.....	278,875	2,946,000	+2,667,125
New York.....	50,806,099	6,681,000	-44,125,099
North Carolina.....	6,845,121	5,655,000	-1,190,121
North Dakota.....	278,875	13,121,000	+12,842,125
Ohio.....	16,200,119	7,187,000	-9,013,119
Oklahoma.....	1,825,365	6,663,000	+4,837,635
Oregon.....	1,723,956	2,763,000	+1,039,044
Pennsylvania.....	20,053,669	5,950,000	-14,103,669
Rhode Island.....	1,419,728	87,000	-1,332,728
South Carolina.....	1,140,853	2,339,000	+1,198,147
South Dakota.....	178,875	6,369,000	+6,190,125
Tennessee.....	2,028,184	7,947,000	+5,918,816
Texas.....	6,718,359	19,988,000	+13,269,641
Utah.....	607,046	1,173,000	+565,954
Vermont.....	278,875	1,027,000	+748,125
Virginia.....	4,715,527	4,804,000	+88,473



*Re agricultural conservation program (payments)—Continued*

State	Proportional part of—		Increase or decrease
	Amount contributed	Amount received	
Washington.....	\$3,397,208	\$3,478,000	+\$80,792
West Virginia.....	1,216,910	1,974,000	+757,090
Wisconsin.....	5,273,278	9,749,000	+4,475,722
Wyoming.....	202,818	2,138,000	+1,935,182
Total.....	250,328,587	253,523,000	-----

<sup>1</sup> Including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and naval stores—not listed.

NOTE.—If the District of Columbia tax percentage was included and the figures carried out to dollars and cents, total of column 1 would equal \$253,523,000. (District of Columbia percentage—\$3,194,389.80; cents not included—\$23.20.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, an analysis of these tables will explain why certain States must insist upon a continuation of these programs. The administrative expenses of the programs are not included in the tables.

I realize that it is useless to criticize the increase in appropriations at this time, but I wish to let the people of the various States know how they fare in these programs. Perhaps with this knowledge we can approach appropriation bills with more caution another year.

**FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—REFERENCE OF NOMINATION OF BURTON N. BEHLING**

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate, the Senate is now bound to consider the controversy between the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. However, the Chair doubts whether the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are prepared to go forward.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am reluctant to go forward at this time. Certainly I would not wish to do so in the absence of the Senator from West Virginia.

**TRUSTEESHIP AGREEMENT FOR THE TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS**

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the Senator makes a motion to adjourn or recess, the Chair suggests that he would like very much, under the circumstances, if he might be permitted to clear up the trusteeship agreement problem, because the Chair is very sure that it can be done in 10 minutes.

Is there objection to a unanimous-consent agreement to proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 233, Calendar No. 526, which unanimously passed the House? The joint resolution relates to trusteeship agreements.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 233), authorizing the President to approve the trusteeship agreement for the Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 233) authorizing the Presi-

dent to approve the trusteeship agreement for the Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement regarding the joint resolution.

The Security Council of the United Nations has unanimously agreed to this trusteeship agreement, on the basis of recognizing the ex-mandated Japanese islands in the Pacific as strategic areas. It is the only strategic trusteeship which the Security Council has developed. It applies, as the Senate knows, to the 98 ex-mandated Japanese islands. The House of Representatives has unanimously passed the joint resolution. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously approved the joint resolution. However, before it did so, it called before it for categorical cross-examination the five men who are most responsible for the national security, namely, Secretary of State Marshall, Secretary of War Patterson, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz.

I say to my colleagues that each of these five officers of the Government, representing the top responsibility for national security, categorically says that the national security is amply and adequately protected under the strategic agreement; and each of the five categorically recommends passage of the joint resolution in the name of national security.

Under all these circumstances, I am sure there ceases to be the slightest controversy, and I hope that the House joint resolution may pass, and that the Senate joint resolution may be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 143 is indefinitely postponed.

**FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—REFERENCE OF NOMINATION OF BURTON N. BEHLING**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate Executive Resolution 52 will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Works be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Burton N. Behling, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1952, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate briefly on a bill which I introduced earlier in the day, dealing with the disposition of our ex-Presidents.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have been engaged in conversation, and I did not hear what the Senator said. Is the Senator from Maine undertaking to obtain consideration of the measure which he introduced earlier in the day?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. I intended to speak about it, to elucidate the reasons why I am interested in it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, am I to understand that the pending business is the resolution to discharge the Committee on Public Works from further consideration of the nomination of Burton N. Behling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will that be the pending business when the Senate convenes tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be determined by whether or not the resolution is disposed of prior to the close of business today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Will it not also depend on whether the Senate recesses or adjourns?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senate adjourn, the pending business will be the order of business at the close of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to go into executive session would be in order at any time, for the reason that it is a privileged motion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say to the Chair and to all Senators who may be interested that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and I are equally anxious to proceed with this question to the earliest possible determination. I shall rest comfortably in the belief that a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution tomorrow will be acted upon favorably, and that we can move forward from then on to a conclusion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I heartily join in the expressed wish that we proceed promptly. I may say further that, because this matter has been delayed so long—not through the fault of the Senator from Maine or myself, but because of important business pending from day to day before the Senate—we have reached the point where action must be taken. Unless we can dispose of the question, since the nomination is before the Committee on Public Works, I shall be impelled, under the circumstances, to give notice of a hearing upon the nomination. For that reason, I think the question of jurisdiction should be determined just as early as possible, and tomorrow.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there will be a motion to adjourn and that after the morning hour this matter will be taken up. I am speaking this evening only because it was my understanding that the two Senators immediately concerned would prefer to take the matter up in the morning rather than try to conclude it tonight. That was my only reason for seeking the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Maine proceed, but I am ready to proceed at any time, and should like to dispose of the matter as soon as possible.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have spoken with my colleague the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and he felt that it would unduly delay the Senate, since we have been in late session for several days.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Undoubtedly, we would not conclude it this afternoon, unless we hold a very late session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to go into executive session is in order at any time, whether it be later this afternoon or tomorrow morning.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I have talked with the majority leader and also with several other Members. I am hoping that the majority leader will give notice that if convenient the calendar will be called tomorrow for the consideration of all measures reported after July 3, when the calendar was last called, because bills are coming in now en masse. I think it will not take very long to dispose of the bills which are not in controversy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the President yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the first order of business is the passage of the appropriation bills. Government employees are going without their salaries, and the bills are long past due. We should consider those bills as rapidly as they are reported to the Senate. I have no doubt that we can reach a point in the consideration of the appropriation bills when the calendar can be called, but I think the appropriation bills should have first priority.

Mr. WHITE. In connection with what the Senator from Ohio has said, notice should be given before there is a call of the calendar. I agree that the pendency of appropriation bills is of such transcendent importance that they should not be shunted aside except for reasons of the greatest importance.

Mr. TAFT. If agreeable to the Senator, I think probably by Wednesday we can call the calendar.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. It was not my idea to interfere with the regular order. If we had not had notice that the Senator from Maine had a speech in his system we could have cleared it up in 20 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. I think it would take a couple of hours.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I object to any intimation that the Senator from Maine has delayed the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Not at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is utterly impossible to proceed without a quorum call, and I am sure there will be some difficulty in getting a quorum without any previous notice. So I hope the Senator will withdraw the suggestion that the

junior Senator from Maine is responsible for the calendar not now being called.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure the Senator misinterpreted my remark. I probably spoke too fast. I said that if the Senator had not had a speech in his system, and notice had been given, we might easily conclude the call of the calendar in 20 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator makes me think of the gentleman who said that if he had some bread he could have a ham sandwich if he had some ham.

#### DESIGNATION OF EX-PRESIDENTS AS SENATORS AT LARGE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I suppose we find no complaint more frequently expressed in executive and legislative offices than that concerning our inability to keep experienced men in Government.

Despite the inducements Government offers, men who attain the caliber to administer and to advise wisely, shortly find the inducements of private enterprise in this free economy of our so attractive that they abandon public office and leave their places to be filled by understudies. Hence we find our administrators, counsellors, and prosecutors too often men who lack experience and maturity of judgment. Government service becomes the preparatory school, or the stepping stone for our law firms and business houses.

There is no full remedy for this situation. So long as the profit motive prevails, and our whole economic structure rightly builds upon that urge, we shall continue to see our most capable men seek the less tumultuous and better-paid life of business and the professions. We can remedy this in part only by increasing the attractiveness of Government service through better salaries, greater assurance of security, and more liberal retirement provisions. Considerable progress has been made along these lines in recent years, but at one point we have been sacrificing needlessly men who are by all odds equipped to render our Government a service beyond that of all others. I speak of the highly extravagant and singularly ruthless abandonment of the men who have served this Nation in the highest office of the land.

History records some very tragic personal consequences of this oversight. Numbers of the men who have served as President have ended their years in financial distress, and a few in abject poverty. It seems a paradox that the man endorsed by the electorate to bear the gravest responsibilities for the Nation's welfare should suddenly find himself completely removed from the intense activity of the Presidency, shorn of all his power and authority, and without even a forum within which he may feel free to speak.

Rutherford B. Hayes described the situation in which an ex-President finds himself in these words:

There is no place in the United States for an ex-President. If I could go into any of the great business enterprises of the country, I would hardly fit, and the country would

not think it proper, so I am devoting my life to delivering lectures before schools, academies and colleges.

This situation lends itself to a very simple and, in my opinion, a very proper solution. I have today introduced a bill to create an office in the Senate of the United States for our ex-Presidents. My bill gives the title of this office "Senator at Large."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a provision of the Constitution which I think makes it impracticable for the Senator to accomplish that which he is proposing. Section 3 of article I of the Constitution provides:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, \* \* \* and each Senator shall have one vote.

If we create another office of Senator it would seem to me that it would be in violation of that section of the Constitution.

I do not wish to take up the Senator's time unless he is interested.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am quite interested.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Constitution also provides for amendment of the Constitution, and says that no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate. The Senator might say that since an ex-President serving as Senator at Large could not vote, that clause of the Constitution would not be impinged upon. But if he could not vote, what would he do in the Senate? He could talk; but we have plenty of that now. He might appear before committees and make speeches, but he could not vote.

It seems to me that the Senator ought to give serious consideration to those clauses in the Constitution before he goes very far with his bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will say to the Senator from Texas that I appreciate his interest. This matter has at various times had a good deal of consideration. While there is some conflict of opinion, the prevailing opinion of the legislative council with whom I took the matter up, is that it would be feasible. The Senator very properly points out that the matter of suffrage could not be affected.

Mr. CONNALLY. But suffrage is not all. The Constitution provides that the States shall not be deprived of their equal representation in the Senate. Voting is not all of their representation. They lobby and talk to many Senators. That is a part of representation, as well as is suffrage.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I feel that there is much in what the Senator from Texas has said. It seems to me the distinction is plainly one of creating an office. I question whether we could create an additional



Senator unless there were a constitutional amendment. I am satisfied that an office could be created, if it did not impinge upon constitutional provisions. Perhaps in that category there might be found a solution of the problem. I do not know just what the office would be; but I feel very deeply myself on the subject which the Senator from Maine is presenting. I feel that men who have devoted their lives to public service and have learned the rules of the game, so to speak, in the Presidency of the United States, should have some way of utilizing their knowledge.

Mention was made of President Hayes. We know that Mr. Hoover and Mr. Coolidge, when they left office, engaged in business. Mr. Coolidge was appointed to an office in one of the great insurance companies.

I shall follow with interest the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I may say that the analogy upon which much of this opinion has been based is that of the Delegates who serve in the House under statutory provision. There is no constitutional provision for it. But they have been freely admitted to all the perquisites of a Representative, other than the privilege of voting.

As the Senator from Texas points out, it is possible that there is a distinction, although as to article V, providing that "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate," I think it is very clear that this bill would not affect that provision, since such Senators at Large would not have a vote.

As to whether there are other provisions in section 3 of article I, which the Senator referred to first, there might be more argument. But I think the prevailing opinion in the occasional discussions of this matter over a long period of time has been that it might be accomplished in the way proposed by this bill.

Mr. President, I may say that my first approach to this matter was by way of constitutional amendment, until I became satisfied that this other approach was perhaps warranted; and we shall present it to the Committee on the Judiciary, to which I assume the bill will be referred, upon that basis.

My bill gives this office the title of Senator at Large. The bill provides that the office shall be available to "any person who heretofore or hereafter shall have held the office of President of the United States and who shall have left such office other than by impeachment." The bill further provides that the office shall carry with it life tenure and all the rights and privileges, including salary and allowances, accorded to Members of the United States Senate, except that such Senator at Large shall not be entitled to vote, and committee assignments shall be specially provided for by rule of the Senate.

Mr. President, it has seemed to me for some time that a means should be devised in our governmental structure whereby the rich abilities of those who have served us as President might be made available after the expiration of their terms of office, and I believe this

is the way to do it. We can ill afford to ignore the enormous reservoir of wisdom and experience which has heretofore been lost to the Nation through the habit of bypassing men possessed of so great a wealth of knowledge and experience in the science of government.

Had this profligate practice prevailed in Great Britain, men of the caliber of Winston Churchill would have been forgotten as long as 25 years ago, with the result that England, and perhaps the world, too, might have been bereft of his dynamic leadership.

Charles Francis Adams, ex-Secretary of the Navy, and a noted author, addressed a letter to John Bigelow in 1906, in which he said in part:

The plan of graduating ex-Presidents directly into the Federal Senate for life is one that has long been a favorite theory of mine. We have lost absolutely the value of the ripe experience, the great abilities, and strong sense of patriotism of such men as Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Van Buren, Cleveland, and Benjamin Harrison. In more than one instance, too, these eminent citizens were cut off from public utility at the maturity of their powers and during the best years of their lives as counselors; while, in more than one case, they themselves have been not only without occupation, but practically without means—objects, almost, of public charity; in the cases of Jefferson and Monroe, indeed actually so.

The pressures on men who leave the Presidency, which dissuade them from seeking commercial or further political preferment, are clearly apparent from the fact that only two of our ex-Presidents have served in the Congress after holding that office. They were John Quincy Adams and Andrew Johnson. Adams served in the House of Representatives for 18 years after retirement from the Presidency, and in fact in certain respects this was the most noteworthy part of his career. Probably it is not so generally remembered that Andrew Johnson came to the Halls of Congress after serving as President, but it is a fact that he was elected to the Senate from the State of Tennessee, and took office in 1875. He lived, however, only a few months after taking office, but, nonetheless, long enough to hear the apologies of many who voted for his impeachment from the Presidency.

Only twice in our history have we been without an ex-President. Washington did not live through John Adams' term, so from 1799 to 1801 we had no ex-President; and with the passing of Andrew Johnson in 1875, the last 2 years of Grant's administration were without any ex-President. We have had as many as five ex-Presidents at one time, but this occurred only once, in the year 1861, and was of less than a year's duration. Milton S. Mayer, writing for *Forum* in March 1933, said about that period that Von Buren, Fillmore, Tyler, Pierce, and Buchanan, "stood around unable to be of use to a Nation that had never been in worse way for sound advice." For the past 75 years the average number of living ex-Presidents has been less than two.

We may well test that fact for its significance. The abrupt change from such tremendous activity, interest, and

responsibility to an abnormally inactive retirement, is, in its effect on a man, not unlike the reaction of the perspiring athlete who is forced to sit unprotected in a freezing temperature. It is beyond the ability of most men to make the adjustment.

Considerable attention has been given to the name by which this office should be designated. I have chosen to stand by the term "Senator at Large," which has had general acceptance by most of those who have expressed interest in this proposition heretofore. I do, however, recognize that quite an advantage might accrue if a better term could be found. The names of the offices of ancient Rome—"consul," "tribune," "praetor"—and our own word "counselor" have come to mind, but do not seem entirely fitting. It is not unlikely that a new word for the office might be coined. For example, a combination of the ideas expressed in the words "consul" and "counselor" could be expressed in a new spelling as "counsul." I should welcome any suggestions on this point.

Questions as to the constitutionality of this proposal are sure to arise, so I have given that phase of the matter some attention. I am confident that there is no constitutional prohibition to the creation of this office, and my opinion is supported by that informally given to me by members of our legislative counsel's staff. Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, who has introduced a similar proposal in the House of Representatives, has obtained the opinion of the legislative counsel in the House to the effect that even as the House admits Delegates from our Territories, giving them the right to speak on the floor and other prerequisites of the Members of the House of Representatives, except that of voting, so the Senate could admit ex-Presidents as Senators at Large without voting privileges.

If these officers were to have the right to vote, then of course it would be necessary to amend the Constitution to admit them to the Senate. Without this right, the equal voting representation of the States in the Senate will not be disturbed. I am confident, too, that the lack of this power will in no wise impair the effectiveness and great influence of those who are entitled to hold the office.

It seems entirely logical to assume that the American electorate which chooses Presidents by popular vote should at the end of the term of a President wish to extend his services in the Senate, whose Members are also elective servants of the people.

In 1943, Gov. Thomas Dewey, of New York, endorsed this idea of establishing an office in the Senate for our ex-Presidents. He said:

For 150 years men have discussed the necessity of bringing into government the ablest men in the country, and yet we have ignored the most obvious means to that end.

Few legislative proposals come to us with almost everything to be said for them on the positive side. By enacting this measure, we assure a proper forum for those whose experience in governmental affairs cannot be duplicated; we afford an honorable livelihood for those

whose position of prestige in public regard makes it virtually impossible for them to enter the usual pursuits of economic or political activity, and we forthwith eliminate this unnecessary loss of the wisdom and advice of our elder statesmen.

I hope the proposal will have sympathetic consideration.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I presume the bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I can assure the distinguished Senator that during the interim between the end of this session and next January, assuming there will be no special session, the specialists of the Committee on the Judiciary will be assigned to study the bill, and be ready to report to the committee, so that definite action can be taken in January.

Mr. BREWSTER. I very much appreciate the assurance of the chairman of the committee. I am quite sure that what he suggests will accomplish all we could desire, as in the recess obviously there would be no purpose of functioning under the bill, and before another election rolls around we shall be able to give the matter the consideration it deserves.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to ask one question. I was a little disturbed when the Senator was talking. Did he define the duties of the proposed officer or officers?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is left entirely within the discretion of the incumbent. He would have a seat in the Senate, he would have the privileges of the floor, and the right to speak; he would have all the perquisites, the salary, and office and staff of a Senator, but without the right to vote. How far he would exercise that responsibility and privilege should be left entirely to his discretion, it seemed to me. I am quite sure we would never need to be concerned that he would exercise the privileges of the floor in a way to delay unduly the deliberations of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. I understand, then, that he would have all the rights of a Senator except the right to vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILEY. That is the Senator's idea?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the concept.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In the light of what the Senator from Wisconsin has just said, and the Senator from Maine has made abundantly clear, the ex-President would have all the prerogatives of a Senator except the right to vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. He would serve on committees, I assume.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is provided in the bill that the rules of the Senate should provide regarding that.

Mr. HATCH. If the bill were enacted, and if the rules were amended accordingly, he could be assigned to various

committees of the Senate, just as any other Senator is.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is within the power contemplated in the bill, but presumably it would be left to the consideration of the Senate and of the ex-President.

Mr. HATCH. As a member of a committee he would have a vote in the committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. That certainly was not contemplated. I assume that would be determined by the rules. If he did not have a vote in the Senate, I do not anticipate he would have a vote in a committee. Whether that should be provided in the bill or in the rules may be a matter of discussion, but it was not contemplated.

Mr. HATCH. I merely raised the question to point out that the theory of having two Senators from each State may be violated by the suggestion of the Senator. The Senator knows full well, of course, the history surrounding the provision in the Constitution. It was a compromise arrived at because of the insistence of the smaller States that they be afforded protection against undue domination and influence of the larger States.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. If under the proposal the Senator makes a Senator-at-large were permitted to come into the Senate, he necessarily would come from some State; his residence would be in some State. He might reside in the largest State in the Union. He might exercise his influence as a resident of that State. If not in contravention of the terms of the Constitution itself, it would undoubtedly do violence to the theory of having two Senators from each State. I merely make the suggestion as something for the Senator and others to consider.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quite appreciate the suggestion. We accord all former Senators the privileges of the floor, so that they are able to do everything on the floor except to speak. Whether the eloquence of an ex-President would influence the Senate more than the activities around the edges of the Chamber I do not know.

Mr. CONNALLY. An ex-Senator is not supposed to utilize the floor for lobbying purposes, he is not supposed to sit on committees, he is not supposed to vote. When he comes here he comes as a guest of the Senate, and is supposed to take off his robes of influence and power before he steps through the Senate door. If I should ever see an ex-Senator on this floor doing anything else, I would rise to a question of the highest privilege.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator from Texas does not mean to intimate that any of our friends who have occupied the high office of President would in any way violate any of the proprieties.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that because a man is President he is much higher than a Senator, so far as ethics and the like are concerned. Why would the Senator want him to be a Member of the Senate if he could not do anything? Why would we want him to be an extra Senator if he could not do anything? He could not vote. What would the Senator do with him? We would add an-

other bench, and that would be all we would be doing.

Mr. BREWSTER. I would provide that he would have the right to speak, and anyone who possesses the silver tongue of the Senator from Texas I am sure can realize how potent an instrument that is.

Mr. BARKLEY. There have been very few Presidents who had the silver tongue of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. WILEY. Hear! Hear!

Mr. BARKLEY. I might offer a suggestion in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Texas about ex-Senators coming into the Senate and taking advantage of the floor. I would not want to be bound to the accuracy of this statement, but I think the Reorganization Act declares that everyone who lobbies, or is here as a lobbyist, must register, whether he is an ex-Senator or not. So that if one is here as a lobbyist in the interest of legislation he is required to register as such, and if he came on the floor of the Senate after having registered as such, we would know he was here probably in a double capacity, that is, as an ex-Senator and as a lobbyist, and we could make up our own minds as to which one was predominant.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very sure there is no occasion for concern either as to the presence of former Senators on this floor or as to the prospective presence of any who may be former Presidents. Of course, I am very hopeful that after next year there may be one from each party available to exercise this privilege.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I believe the distinguished Senator who has presented the proposal has placed in the lap of the Committee on the Judiciary a matter which is going to be very interesting to study and consider. First impressions are not always those I follow after studying a subject. I believe that there is a field in which the experience and the talents of ex-Presidents, the results of what they have learned through life, can be utilized for the benefit of the Republic. I believe there is such a field.

The Senator spoke of Churchill. Of course, under the British Constitution, as I understand, he goes into the House of Commons. Under legislation we have provided for the presence in the House of Representatives from the Territories.

It may be that out of this proposal there may be evolved the correct solution, and I hope that will follow. My first impression, as I have said, is that it is very difficult to give an individual all the rights of a Senator for life except the right to vote. It seemed to me that that transgressed the constitutional provision referred to by the Senator from Texas. However, that matter will be thoroughly studied. If it is found, in the judgment of those who go into the subject, that the proposal meets head on with the constitutional provision, I take it that it will be consistent with the views of the distinguished Senator if there should be a suggestion from the committee as to how to utilize the brains,



the intellect and the training of an ex-President, a subject which for a long time has been in my mind.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, my initial approach was the constitutional one, and I drafted a constitutional amendment to that end. I may say to the Senator from Texas that I quite concur with him that there is no office of higher distinction than that of a Senator of the United States: That is why I felt it was an honor that we might properly confer upon those who have served our country in the high office of President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that the reason no Senator ever aspires to be President or Vice President, because there is nothing higher than the Senate?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is right. I think that is why there is such an observance of the Self-Denying Ordinance of Oliver Cromwell.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think I would oppose a pension for an ex-President, if it were desired to compensate him adequately for his services. Former President Hoover has been available in the postwar period. He has rendered some very distinguished, some very fine service, but he did not have to be elected Senator to do it. If he were a pensioner of the Government, adequately remunerated, I think we could use an ex-President, and I think his services would be rewarded with more appreciation and dignity than if he were one of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is all a matter to be considered. But I wonder if the Senator from Texas realizes that for 14 years we did not avail ourselves of the services of former President Hoover, that it was only done during the past 2 years.

Mr. CONNALLY. He availed himself of it, if we did not. He has been from time to time handing out interviews on various matters, like Mr. Baruch. He is a prominent citizen. I think Mr. Hoover deserves well of his country. I think he has done some fine work, but he did not do it because he was a Member of the Senate. If we should pension ex-Presidents, and merely have them sit on a bench outside the Senate, to be called when needed, I think it would be better than to have them in the Senate. If an ex-President were in the Senate, whether with or without a vote, he would soon be lined up with one little group on this side, or with another little group on the other side, and he would be playing politics. He would be telling them how to do things, and he would be planning how he could get back into the office of President again. In that event, instead of having seven or eight candidates for President on the Republican side, there would be still another one.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder if the Senator from Texas realizes the protocol which kept Herbert Hoover out of Washington 14 years because he was not welcome at the White House, and that it was only when President Truman invited him, shortly after his accession, that it became even appropriate under the unwritten rules that he should come to

Washington and counsel with those who were concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator knows more about backstage gossip than does the Senator from Texas, and about matters of protocol, the fact that Mr. Hoover was not welcome and all that sort of thing. I do not know that that is true. If the Senator from Maine says it is true and that he knows it, I accept it. But what has that to do with the question before us? Mr. Hoover could still be ignored by the President in the same way, even if he were a so-called Senator. I have known several Senators who were ignored. I have a private list of them. I could add several more to it.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is looking at Senators who have been ignored.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, I am not. I have a high regard for the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, formerly a member of the Foreign Relations Committee over which I was privileged to preside. I am sure he would never be ignored by anybody, because he would not permit it. I do not think the question of whether the President takes an ex-President to his bosom or not has anything to do with the Senate. Under the bill, we would be the ones to take him to our bosoms.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is precisely what I am proposing, and while I would not undertake to set forth what is in the Presidential mind at the time, because we do not quote the President, I can say that I quoted him in his earlier incarnation, when he was a Senator. This subject was many times discussed, and the idea was rather cordially at that time approved.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Maine seems to specify ex-President Hoover as being the only living ex-President ever to have been ignored by the White House. I seem to recall that Theodore Roosevelt, while he was an ex-President, was ignored at the White House by President Taft; so completely ignored that he ran against Taft for the nomination. He was defeated. He then ran as an independent on the Bull Moose ticket.

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly the Senator from Kentucky did not object to that?

Mr. BARKLEY. I had nothing to do with it. I was not in the convention, and I had no right to object. I did not take any part in that controversy at all. I recall when I was a young man Grover Cleveland went out of the Presidential office and moved to Princeton, where he continued to reside for a long time thereafter. I do not recall that he was ever invited to come to Washington to consult with a President then in office. He wrote many articles, in the Saturday Evening Post and other magazines, and he was a very distinguished figure.

Mr. BREWSTER. He came back to the Presidency after 4 years, though, of course.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am speaking of the period following his final retirement, in 1897. He lived at Princeton, an honored ex-President, until his death in 1908. I

do not recall that Grover Cleveland was ever invited to Washington to consult with the President, whoever he might have been, McKinley or Theodore Roosevelt, either one, in order that he might help him to run the Government. So the instance, if it is an instance, of Mr. Hoover's not having been invited to come to Washington by Mr. Roosevelt, who was his successful opponent in 1932, is no isolated case, even if it were true. I do not recall that even Presidents of the same party as the one who is retiring, or who had retired immediately preceding, have been conspicuous in inviting their predecessors to come to Washington to help run the Government. So I do not think it is exactly fair to point to Mr. Hoover as not having been invited here for 14 years. I do not know whether he was invited or not. I know that Franklin D. Roosevelt invited Wendell Willkie, who ran against him in 1940, although not elected, to come to Washington. They conferred very frequently, and I think there grew up between them a high degree of respect because of the frankness with which their views were expressed.

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not mean in any way to reflect on the action of President Roosevelt. I welcome the suggestion about precedents in other cases, which would establish that it was not an isolated occurrence. I only meant to refer to the fact that under the practices and precedents it is awkward for a former President to visit Washington under a successor; let us say, of any party. If he were established here in a respectable, a responsible position, all that would be washed away. I think it was a great loss to the country that Grover Cleveland was not available in the Senate during that period, with his outstanding experience and public service; and I think that would similarly be true of Presidents of either party, throughout our entire history.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know that I am right, but I have a feeling that if Grover Cleveland had been sent to Washington as a sort of ex officio, roving Senator during the long years he lived after he retired from the White House he would have lowered his own dignity and in a way cheapened his influence with the country. He was free to speak and to write. Whatever he said was read by the people of the United States. It was done in a dispassionate way. It was not done because of any office that he held. Every utterance of an ex-President, if he were an ex officio Senator, would be construed in the light of his Senatorship, and not simply because he was an ex-President, free from the turmoil of senatorial debate, free from the political clashes which take place here and which sometimes even weaken our own influence and our own standing among our constituents. I am interested, I will say to the Senator, in finding a way—it has been under discussion a long time—by which former Presidents may be utilized in the service of their country. Various suggestions have been made, but I should want to think about it a long time before I accepted the theory that an ex-President would add dignity or influence to his personality

and to his advocacy of anything, because he might be permitted to become a Senator, draw a senatorial salary, and rise and speak on any subject, but not to vote on it. In my judgment, the right to vote may not be given to any roving Senator, any Senator emeritus, if we might call him that, without amending the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate very much the Senator's suggestion. I introduced the bill at this time in order that there might be an opportunity during the recess for the mature deliberation which a proposal of this importance would undoubtedly invite. I shall seek to keep an open mind myself about the matter, both as to the Constitution and as to the wisdom of such a plan.

#### DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE MANSFIELD, OF TEXAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

In the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

July 14, 1947.

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, a Representative from the State of Texas.

*Resolved*, That a committee of five Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 151) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the committee provided for in the second resolving clause of the resolution, the Chair appoints the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect for the memory of the deceased Representative, I move

that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 15, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 14, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Chaplain Daniel F. Meehan, United States Navy, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

O ineffable Creator, out of the treasures of Thy infinite wisdom, grant to these representatives of our people clearness of discernment, acumen in judgment, righteousness in decision, honesty of purpose, and fidelity to their office, so that our Nation may benefit from their deliberations and our beloved country prosper by their legislation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 11, 1947, was read and approved.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, Members who have been granted special orders for today may, if they so desire, extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There was no objection.

#### TERMINATING CERTAIN EMERGENCY WAR POWERS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 288, Rept. No. 902), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) to terminate certain emergency and war powers, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 289, Rept. No. 903), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself

into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4102) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### TRANSFERRING LANDS TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 290, Rept. No. 904), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3043) to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### LEGISLATIVE AND DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILLS, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on the legislative appropriation bill, 1948, and the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that



the special order previously granted me for today may be postponed until tomorrow.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **ROGERS** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order previously granted me for today may be postponed until tomorrow.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. **LECOMPTE**, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 12, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3647. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act and the Export Control Act, and for other purposes.

#### THE LATE JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. **RAYBURN**].

Mr. **RAYBURN**. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of terrible sadness and of anguish that I announce to the House the passing of **JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD**, for more than 30 years a Member of this body. He died soon after he had passed his eighty-sixth birthday.

You all knew **Judge MANSFIELD**. You have seen him as the chairman of a great committee, as he had himself rolled into the well of this House, and he always had his bill well in hand.

I have said it before, and I say it again, that in my opinion **Judge MANSFIELD** was the most popular man, the most loved man, not only in his own delegation but in the House of Representatives, and he deserved it.

I have served in this House with more than 2,100 men and women in 34 years. That shows how fast we change. It shows that a turn-over of more than 100 occurs each election. With 18 elections, more than 2,100 men and women have served in this House with me. They have been men and women of high character and lofty ideals, the majority of them of outstanding ability.

But of all those men and women, none surpassed and few equaled **Judge MANSFIELD** in ability or in bigness of soul. God never made a finer man nor greater character than **Judge MANSFIELD**. After 30 years of his loyalty to me, and mine to him, the sadness deepens that I will not see him again, nor again see his like as I have few times in my life—towering, good, just, pure patriot. Wherever good

men and women who have passed from this earth are assembled this day, **Judge MANSFIELD** is with them, welcomed with open arms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. **HALLECK**].

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of **Judge MANSFIELD**, the oldest Member of this House, we have lost one of our ablest colleagues. We have lost a great and precious friend.

**Judge MANSFIELD** was a constant inspiration to me. He was a tireless worker and he radiated happiness and contentment. He was happy in the service of his district, his State, and his country. And I do not believe any man has made a greater contribution.

I shall always remember the courteous consideration he gave me when I first came here as a new Member of Congress. He was patient and understanding.

**Judge MANSFIELD** was a kindly man, a good man who was never touched by the pomp of power. His everlasting smile expressed the goodness and sincerity of his heart. I do not believe I have ever been associated with a man of finer character and greater stature. Truly, he was one of God's noblemen, whose vision, integrity, and talents were worthy of any man.

In **Judge MANSFIELD** the Nation has lost a strong man and a devoted servant. All of us have lost a dear friend. While he is no longer with us, his words and deeds are enshrined forever in our hearts, and we would do well to emulate him. He has left "footprints on the sands of time which perhaps another, some forlorn and forsaken brother, seeing, may take heart again."

Mr. **RAYBURN**. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. **DONDERO**].

Mr. **DONDERO**. Mr. Speaker, the flags over the Nation's Capital are at half mast. It is notice that an elected Representative of the people has fallen. **JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD**, of Texas, will no longer respond to a call of the House. He will answer "present" in that silent chamber where there is no middle aisle. Every Member mourns his passing.

Born during the tragic era of our beloved country, his span of life—fourscore years and six—covered more than one-half our Nation's history. **James Buchanan**, the fifteenth President, was in office at the time of his birth. He lived during the administrations of more than one-half of all Presidents of the United States.

He was best known to all of us as "Judge" **MANSFIELD**. His noble character and genial personality endeared him to everyone.

To serve as a Member of the House of Representatives is a distinction for any man. To serve continuously for more than 30 years is an honor and a tribute which comes to very few men in public life. Only 4 of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives exceeded him in length of continuous service. It testifies to the ability and public service of **JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD**. It is mute evidence of the respect, esteem, and affection in which he was held by the people he represented in this body.

To him also belong the unique distinction and honor, both nobly earned, of having served longer on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors than any other man, since that committee was created 64 years ago. That service extended over a period of 26 years.

He was my chairman for 14 years. He was always fair. Politics were unknown in his rulings and decisions. To the members of his committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, he always exhibited uniform respect, kindness, consideration, and courtesy.

We were often amazed in committee by his remarkable memory and thorough grasp of the river and harbor systems of our country. His counsel and advice was eagerly sought and respected.

He was indeed an eminent and illustrious American. By the suffrage of his people he had been entrusted with public responsibility for over 58 years. I doubt if there is a comparable record for integrity and fidelity which exceeds that of our departed colleague. The people of his congressional district, the State of Texas, and the country at large have lost a valuable, honest, and capable Representative.

The entire membership of the House unites in tendering our sincere sympathy to his family.

Mr. **RAYBURN**. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. **THOMASON**].

Mr. **THOMASON**. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth Congressional District of Texas has lost one of its greatest citizens. This body has lost a valuable Member. The Nation has lost an outstanding public servant.

**Judge MANSFIELD** was a great man and he came of great stock. He was a direct descendant of **Thomas Jefferson**. He not only believed in, but he practiced, democracy. His father was killed in the Civil War. When the war was over his mother took young **JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD**, and her other children to Texas to become citizens of that growing empire.

For approximately 60 years, without a break, he was honored by his people. He has held public office in his own county and district for 30 years, and at the age of 56 he came here to serve 30 years, and he died one of its most distinguished and one of its most beloved Members.

No man can serve his people for 60 years without being a man of character, ability, and the highest order of patriotism. So I am sure I voice the sentiments of every Member of this House in saying that he is going to be greatly missed. Until his recent illness he seldom missed a roll call or an important session of the House. He never complained or made reference to his physical misfortunes. He scattered sunshine and wisdom wherever he went. He was a Christian gentleman and a great statesman. All I can say is that all of us not only will miss him but we will do well to emulate his virtues.

Mr. **RAYBURN**. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. **PLUMLEY**].

Mr. **PLUMLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I have lost a friend.

A great man from a great State in this Union has gone to receive the accolade of "just men made perfect." May he rest in that peace for which a lifetime he fought.

If ever there were a man who could claim the distinction of being self-made, then JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD pre-eminently qualified for that distinction. Farm laborer, baggagemaster, freight clerk, lawyer, judge, mayor of city, school superintendent, captain of the Texas National Guard, grand master of the Texas Masons, newspaper editor and publisher, head of a fire department, for 20 years or more vestryman of St. John's Episcopal Church, this man MANSFIELD came to Congress eventually to become one of its most distinguished and outstanding leaders and most respected Members. What a career! What a challenge to those who say there are no frontiers for the youth of today.

JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD did not lose his life. He gave it; and all of it. He contributed so much to the welfare of the people of the country he loved that words are not sufficient, adequately to measure the loss we feel or the debt we owe to him.

Those of us who have enjoyed the high privilege to serve with him will miss the little old wheel chair, and our friend who accepted his physical disability and responsibility so philosophically, so cheerfully, and so gracefully and beneficently contributed of himself and of his wisdom to us over the years.

Although he was not a native, Texas never had a son more typically Texan, nor better qualified to represent it in the Halls of Congress than JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD.

The country has lost one of its ablest legislators and most zealous defenders as well as one of its most conscientious representatives. The House has lost a friend—a man who surmounted a serious physical handicap to inspire every one of us to try to do a better day's work each day. All of us will miss Judge MANSFIELD, the Democrat of Columbus, Tex.

As Antony said of Caesar, so say we all of Judge MANSFIELD:

His life was gentle; and the elements  
So mixed in him, that Nature might stand  
up,  
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD the House has lost its noblest and most lovable Member. I join with his colleagues from the great State of Texas and with all the Members of the House in tribute to his life and character.

Judge MANSFIELD was born February 9, 1861, and he died on July 12, 1947. The span of his life was 86 years, 5 months, and 3 days. His successes, like the length of his days, were many, and his achievements were beneficial alike to his district, his State, and the country.

Judge MANSFIELD was well prepared for service in the House. He had occupied positions of importance in public life for 30 years before he became a Member of the House of Representatives.

He had thus grown up in the public service. He was familiar with the problems of his district, with the needs of his State, and with public questions that confronted the country. While always interested in the problems of his district, he possessed the national viewpoint. He was aware that his district could not advance unless there were progress and improvements in all of the States.

He was industrious. No Member was more constant and attentive in his committee work. There is no better opportunity to take the real measure of a Member of the House than in connection with committee work. Members of the committees know full well the work and the worth of fellow members. It is on committees that Members come to know and esteem one another as is not possible in connection with other services in the House.

Judge MANSFIELD served as chairman and as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors longer than any other person who has ever been a member of that committee since it was established in 1883. He was a great chairman. He was more familiar with rivers, harbors, and waterways than any other man in the Congress. He was an accomplished chairman. He was courteous, patient, tolerant, and well informed. He knew his bills. The members of the committee relied upon him, and the House followed his judgment. He enjoyed the confidence of the members of his committee and of the House to an unusual degree.

Judge MANSFIELD served as a Member of the House for more than 30 years. He was elected and reelected for 16 terms. For the past 25 years he was compelled to use a wheel chair. His affliction resulted from a bone infection. Notwithstanding his handicap, it is said that he never took a vacation. He devoted himself exclusively to his congressional duties. In fact, he seemed to concentrate and to be capable of doing even better work as a result of his affliction. As a result of his industry, his achievements, his devotion to the work of his committee, and his success as chairman, he was an inspiration to the entire Membership of the House. I marveled at his work when I thought of his handicap. Personally, I was inspired to greater efforts when I reflected that I was more fortunate than he with his physical handicap.

Judge MANSFIELD was devoted to service in the House of Representatives. He was a patriot. When he was an infant in his mother's arms, his father was killed on the field of battle. He was courageous. He had convictions, and he had the courage of his convictions. With him his country came first. He was a great American.

Judge MANSFIELD had become an institution in the House of Representatives. The House will not be the same without him. He was a gentleman. He was an accomplished legislator. We shall not see his like again.

Judge JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, full of honors and full of years, has been gathered unto his fathers. His passing has brought universal regret. He lived a full and an abundant life. He

leaves to his family a good name. He gave to his district, his State, and his country a record of splendid public service.

We honor his memory, and we pay tribute today to one of the most remarkable Members who ever served in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, in addition to expressing my own feelings, I am quite sure the people of my district would want me to join with our colleagues from Texas, and others, today, in paying respect to our deceased colleague from Texas, the Honorable JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD.

Mr. MANSFIELD was born in what is now the district which I have the honor of representing—in Wayne County, W. Va., which is adjacent to my home county. I met him soon after I came to Congress.

While he left our State in the eighties to go to Texas, he knew our country well, knew the older families, and always displayed a keen interest in our section. We visited together frequently and he always liked to talk about his old home county and the people there. Many in West Virginia knew him and often inquired about his well-being. I learned to admire him greatly and found him to be a man of splendid character and fine ability.

Mr. MANSFIELD was loyal to his country, his State, and the district he represented so faithfully and ably.

The people of my community in West Virginia join with his thousands of Texas friends and the Members of this body in paying respect to the memory of a great man, and our sympathy goes out to his loved ones.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly pained by the passing of our distinguished colleague and my good friend, Judge MANSFIELD. In my opinion there is not a Member of this body for whom the entire membership had a higher or more affectionate regard. Judge MANSFIELD was a true, able, efficient, and diligent representative of the people and of his district, and outstanding in his service to the entire country. We all remember how he carried on under his great affliction and his great physical handicap. He was finally an inspiration to all of us. His passing not only is a great loss to his district and to the State of Texas, but to the Nation as a whole. To the members of his family I extend my deepest and most sincere sympathies in their great sorrow and bereavement. A truly great and a truly good man has passed to his final reward.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the younger Members who knew Judge MANSFIELD. I came to know him almost the first day that I entered Congress, because my office was on the same floor where he had his office. There is very little that I can add to



what has been said about Judge MANSFIELD today.

He was a kind, tolerant man. He was very friendly. He tried to help the new Members. I distinctly remember a number of occasions when he helped me tremendously. As you look back over his life, I can think of no man whose life covered as varied and wide a sweep and tremendous change in our national life as did the life of Judge MANSFIELD. Think of it. He was born at the time of Lincoln, and he lived to see the atomic age. If a man can live in that sort of a period, I can think of no better time than in such a time.

Judge MANSFIELD had a very broad outlook on the United States as a nation. His study of harbor problems encompassed the whole Nation. As has been mentioned heretofore, when he came on the floor with river and harbor bills, he always knew the last detail of those bills.

While we have to confess that when a man is 86 years of age the end is certainly in sight, it is sad to get the bad news but it is pleasant to know and remember that everything about this man that you can think of is good. We will always look back upon his memory as a modest, able, tolerant, and Christian gentleman. It certainly was a pleasure to know him, and everybody that knew him will miss him tremendously.

With all the tremendous changes that have taken place in the physical world during JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD's life he still is a forcible reminder that kindness, courtesy, gentleness, and character are the mark of a man. He will be a model that we hope we will be strong enough to emulate. In that way his influence will have a marked effect on many of us for many years to come. Judge MANSFIELD was a true gentleman in every sense of the word, and I am thankful that I had the opportunity of knowing him and confess he has had great influence over me.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday the body of Judge MANSFIELD began its last trip to Texas, his home country, to the people whom he loved. Judge MANSFIELD loved Washington, he loved Texas, he loved his colleagues, he loved life, and it is not surprising that people loved him, it is not surprising that people were drawn irresistibly to him.

When I first came here as a new Member, Judge MANSFIELD was well more than twice my age, but his exuberance and boyishness of character easily spanned those years. There was something about him that made all those associated with him love him and confide in him.

No tongue is sufficiently eloquent and no pen is sufficiently facile to pay adequate tribute to our beloved and departed friend. I shall not undertake to do so.

Mr. Speaker, at present I am serving as chairman of the Texas delegation in Congress. In that capacity I should like in a measure, as has the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], to speak for all, as it is not possible for all to be heard and some are not here. He was much beloved among us. We took pride in the

fact that he was tops with us all, the most beloved Member of the House of Representatives. In our frequent councils of the Texas delegation, Judge MANSFIELD made it a point to be present. He spoke last; he always spoke best. His counsel, his judgment, his smile, that indefinable something about him which no one can describe, drew us always to him. We pay tribute and honor to our departed friend.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ROHRBOUGH].

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, may I pay tribute to the memory of our friend as one who has known him and his family for many years?

To my mind, our late colleague the gentleman from Texas symbolizes as much as anyone I have known the literal meaning of the word gentleman. His was a gentle spirit. He was able, wise, and strong, yet always considerate of others. I have never seen him when he was not adequate to the situation that confronted him.

When the pronouncement was made, "The gentleman's time has expired; all time has expired," I am sure he faced the inevitable with the same courage and fearlessness that characterized him when he was among us.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our beloved colleague Judge MANSFIELD constitutes a keen personal loss to me. Our colleagues from the other States of the Union join with the delegation from the State of Texas in the loss that they have sustained and share with them the keen regrets that they feel as a result of the death of such a distinguished Representative from their great State.

The death of Judge MANSFIELD is also a great loss to this body and to the people of the United States. If ever a Member of this body with whom I have served exemplified the broad national spirit of our country in its finest aspects, it is our late friend, Judge MANSFIELD.

The feelings we possess on an occasion like this are more completely expressed by what we do not say rather than what we do say. At the end of one's journey in life, what really remains is the spirit, the light, so to speak, from his candle of life. The light from some candles shine on forever. The length of time that the light which reflects a person's life will shine on depends on what a person puts into life while he is making his journey on this earth.

Judge MANSFIELD's light will always shine on and will always remain in the hearts of the people of his district. It will always be a pattern for future Representatives of his congressional district to follow. That light will remain in the memory of all of us who have had the honor of knowing our late beloved friend.

I have never met anyone in my journey of life for whom I have a higher regard; and I say these words with all sincerity—I have never met anyone who exemplified to a greater degree kindness, gentleness, and tolerance, and the other fine elements that go to make up nobility of

character, than did our late colleague, Judge MANSFIELD.

God, in His infinite wisdom, has taken Judge MANSFIELD into His eternal home.

Because of the life that Judge MANSFIELD exemplified, I am confident he did not fear the call that came from the Supreme Being. I am certain he faced that call with confidence, and that God, in His infinite wisdom, has welcomed him into His kingdom.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sad heart I learned of the passing of our beloved and venerable colleague JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD, late chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House. I have been a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House since I entered the Congress and through the years have learned to know and to love our departed friend.

I know of no one in the Congress who took a greater or more personal interest in the new Members of the House than did Judge MANSFIELD. He presided over the meetings of this great committee with absolute fairness and without any partisan considerations. While he was a member of the majority party, he was never found wanting in courtesy and consideration to every member of the minority party. There was no other man in the Congress and perhaps anywhere in the Nation who had a broader understanding and more accurate knowledge of the water developments of our country. He knew every river and port and from memory could give detailed statistics as to tonnage shipments and characteristics thereof. In his personal associations with the members of his committee and his colleagues he maintained an enviable position. He was beloved by everyone who knew him. It can be said that Judge MANSFIELD did not have an enemy in the Congress.

Those of us who have learned to lean upon him and to profit by his broad experience in legislative matters, particularly those having to do with our waterways and ports, will miss him. A great and good man, beloved by all of us, has left this Chamber forever, but his good works will live on as an inspiration to all of us who may linger on yet a little while, until our call comes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it has been my good fortune to serve with more than 2,800 men during my service in this House. They were, generally speaking, great and able men, but I do not know of a single one of them who possessed more learning in the science of government and was a finer character or dominated by a greater interest in and love of country than Judge MANSFIELD. He was broadminded, tolerant, understanding, and patriotic. I have long known him personally because of the interest he took in the general welfare of people of the whole Union and especially those of his own district. Only a few men have been given opportunity to serve here so long as our departed friend, only

four Members having longer service than he at the time of his passing.

In all his legislative work he well lived up to part of the illustrious name he bore, Jefferson.

Early in my service here, realizing the agricultural future of America and opportunities afforded here, especially in the great State of Texas, on occasion I advised many foreigners, including Bohemians, to acquire land, which was easily obtainable at about \$2 an acre in Texas, thus avoiding overcrowded cities. From the day that Judge MANSFIELD came to this House he continually informed me how well those people whom I had helped to reach that section of the country and his district were doing, what good citizens they were, and how pleased he was with the good results. Naturally, I have always been proud of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I possessed the ability to add to the deserved tributes that have been paid to this honorable deceased, because he was a great and wonderful soul, a great American. I join with others in paying my tribute to this eminent legislator, this great Member of this House, and a man who so unselfishly took such a profound interest in the welfare of the whole country which, I know, will very much miss him and his wise counsel.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I feel I might be remiss to the instincts of gratitude and friendship if I did not pay a tribute to the memory of our distinguished colleague, Judge JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD.

When I first became a Member of the House of Representatives I was appointed to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which Judge MANSFIELD was chairman. I remember how kind, how helpful he was not only to me but to all the members of that committee. I remember his profound knowledge of the questions that came before the committee. He was a gentleman in the highest sense of the word. His genial nature radiated something akin to sunshine on an April day. All who knew him had a profound respect not only for his knowledge and ability but for his character. Judge MANSFIELD was an able man, and as usual with able men, he was a simple man. In him there was no vanity, nor jealousy, nor envy. He never spoke evil of anyone.

He will long be remembered by his colleagues, and I know by his State and by his Nation as a great public servant. It is given to few men to serve his people as long as Judge MANSFIELD has served them. He has a record of service of which his friends may well be proud and which must be a solace to his family in their hour of grief. He has builded a character and he has made a record that will entitle him to the reward that comes to the faithful and the just.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for our membership, but I think more particularly so perhaps for the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and myself, for we came to Congress

nearly 31 years ago with Judge MANSFIELD. Some great men came in that Congress, former Speaker William B. Bankhead and Judge MANSFIELD, among others.

It hardly seems possible that more than 30 years have intervened since I first became acquainted with the able, indefatigable, and genial Member from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD; and today my heart is heavy. We grieve with the sorrowing family. We deplore the loss our country and the great State of Texas have sustained in his passing.

Judge MANSFIELD was probably one of the best-posted authorities on rivers and harbors with whom I have served; and those of you who ever had occasion to call upon him in connection with some project in your home State or district will remember with a glow of satisfaction and gratitude this great brotherly American who has passed to his reward. I can visualize him now sitting on the stoop of that place that we all hope to go to some day, visiting and talking over old times and days with Joe Cannon, Champ Clark, Jim Mann, Nick Longworth, Henry Rainey, Joe Byrnes, Bill Bankhead, and the many other colleagues who have passed on to that undiscovered bourne from whence no traveler returns. They will want to know how JOE MARTIN is making out as Speaker, and how is SAM RAYBURN. They will bid their old friend welcome, and want to know what is holding some of the old-timers, and that will remind "Uncle Joe" of an incident that happened while he was riding the circuit with Abe Lincoln, which will open the daily anecdote hour.

I can see them, all honest, able, conscientious Americans who served their country with fidelity and conspicuous ability.

Why anyone should dread the transition from this vale of tears to the many mansions our Father has prepared for us is beyond my understanding. Rather it should be life's greatest adventure, and so I know JOE MANSFIELD, my old-time friend, has found it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, another milestone along the highway of life has become the monument to a departed friend.

Judge MANSFIELD will undoubtedly be the last Member of the Congress of the United States whose father was killed in that unfortunate conflict known as the Civil War or the War Between the States.

His passing marks the end of an era as well as the end of a great and noble career.

Left an orphan in his infancy, he went through all those trials and struggles that go to make America's great, and was honored by his State and by his district as few men have ever been honored by the people of the great Lone Star Commonwealth.

He was at one time grand master of the Masonic Lodge of Texas, an honor which to us Masons is second to none the people of his State can bestow.

For 30 years he had been a Member of this, the greatest legislative body on earth. They may talk about the body

at the other end of the Capitol being the greatest deliberative body in the world, which it is; but the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is the greatest legislative body on earth, as well as the greatest representative body in the world.

When I came to Congress, Judge MANSFIELD's office was next to mine. I learned to love him as a father. He could walk in those days, although he walked with a cane. It was several years before he reached the point where he had to move around in a rolling chair.

I served with him on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and I do not hesitate to say that no man who has come to Congress from the great State of Texas within the last 50 years has done more for the people of that great Commonwealth than did JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD in the development of the great Intercoastal Waterway, which should bear his name. His life should be an inspiration to every struggling youth of the land, because it exemplifies what America means, individualism.

When I think of the great struggles through which he passed from the time he was orphaned in his infancy until he had visited upon him the greatest honors the people of his State and of his district could bestow, I am reminded of those immortal lines:

One ship drives east and another drives west  
As the selfsame breezes blow.  
'Tis the set of the sail and not the gale  
That bids them where to go.

Like the winds of the sea are the ways of fate  
As we journey along through life,  
'Tis the set of the soul that decides the goal  
And not the calm or the strife.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, after the beautiful tributes that have been paid to our beloved friend, JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, it is with a feeling of distinct handicap that I attempt to express in my own way the feeling of loss and sadness as well of abiding and deep affection that I have for that great and fine American. The tribute which was paid to Judge MANSFIELD by our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and the tribute paid by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], and that of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], as do what I say, come from the heart and are moving tributes to those of us for whom it is difficult upon such an occasion to speak. But I think of Judge MANSFIELD as one of the first men with whom I became acquainted when I came here, because to so many in the gallery he was the "gentleman in the wheel chair." But when we reflect a little upon his career, of how he spent over 50 years in public service, starting as a county attorney, and serving his people and impressing them with his tolerance and his sincerity and ability, and coming from there to Congress, where he helped solve the tremendous problems of the past 30 years, and considering the physical handicaps and afflictions that he had, you will remember that usually it was he was said John or Joe or Bill "How are you?" And extended that hand of friendship to you



as he met you in the corridor. He was a kindly, saintly man. I recall with some trembling that I approached him upon what I thought was a very small matter before his committee, pertaining to my district. Immediately he made me feel at ease and impressed me with the fact that that was one of the important matters which should be considered by his committee. I think the greatest lesson we could leave by example—the greatest thesis for a sermon that could be preached—would be to take Judge MANSFIELD's life, with the physical handicap that he had, maintaining a youthful mind, and a kindly mind, and a helpful mind, as an example of the Golden Rule in a troubled and often harried existence as Members of Congress.

He never forgot that the other person had problems which to that person were equal to his, yet Judge MANSFIELD had the greatest problem of all. He was afflicted with ill health, yet he never let it affect the humanness of his mind or the tolerance of his decisions or his kindly spirit. That gracious virtue—of the Christian spirit—endeared Judge MANSFIELD to all of us. May his soul rest in eternal peace.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, much as I shall miss my noble friend, Judge MANSFIELD, I can think only of how very fortunate this country is that he has lived. My life has been enriched because I knew him and was associated with him. My country is a better place, my State is a finer State, my life is a finer life because Judge MANSFIELD lived. Upon such characters, such fine minds, such noble hearts was built this magnificent country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, saddened as we are, I think we should all rejoice that we have had the privilege of living in the presence of so noble, so good, and so fine a man.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know of no greater contribution a person can make to his nation than to live the type of life that has been lived by Hon. JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD. I have had the pleasure of knowing him through all the years I have served in Congress, and I can endorse all the beautiful things that have been said about him by men who have taken the floor here today to pay tribute to him.

It has been said that there is no act of man which is not the beginning of a chain of consequences so long that there is no human providence high enough to give us a prospect to the end. Judge MANSFIELD has made a tremendous contribution to the character of this great Nation of ours. I wish every youth in the United States could see his life spread out before him so that he might be inspired to emulate him.

Judge MANSFIELD was a true American. He believed in the fundamental principles which have made this Republic great. He believed in the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of the United States, and he lived according to those principles. His spirit will live on for years and years. I could demonstrate

that it would live on for centuries inspiring the youth of this land. I am sure now that we know the great contribution our dear friend has made as a public servant we may feel a greater sense of responsibility in the official position which we occupy. Judge MANSFIELD has lived a life that will be an example and an inspiration to the youth who are coming along to take our place. Perhaps we sometimes fail to realize the extent to which the public spotlight is upon us because of the positions we hold. The Congress, therefore, is judged by the conduct of its Members. I hope that in the future the reputation and the character of Congress can be judged by the life, the splendid life, the Christian life, the fine American life, which Judge MANSFIELD has lived.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a great soul has passed away. He has now crossed the river and stands on the other side in the cool of the evening. Judge JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, after 30 years of service in the House of Representatives, has left us for a higher service.

During his long and distinguished career in the House, "the Judge," as we fondly called him, gave his time and talents to rivers and harbors work. No one like myself who comes from the State of Louisiana, with its thousands of rivers, streams, creeks, and bayous, could be oblivious to the guiding genius which our deceased colleague used as chairman of the important Committee of the House on Rivers and Harbors, in which position he served until the beginning of this Congress. In fact, no one wherever inland waters flow can fail to appreciate his solicitude, his earnest direction, and his great ability applied to the need and to the development of our great water resources.

Years ago, while actively serving in this body, Congressman MANSFIELD sustained a tragic physical set-back. One of lesser determination might have fallen by the wayside and given up. But not so with our late departed colleague. He met the handicap with renewed efforts and greater determination. A poet has well said:

It is easy enough to be pleasant  
When life flows by like a song;  
But the man worth while  
Is one who will smile  
When everything goes dead wrong.

Congressman MANSFIELD met the world with a smile. "Ever with a glad some heart, he took the sunshine and the rain opposed." He was always courteous and friendly. As he daily sat here to the right of his desk in his wheel chair, he greeted everyone with affection and with genuine and continuing interest. As we commend him to the Almighty, we know we have lost a great friend. We shall miss him very much.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is rare indeed when we pay tribute to a man who is alive instead of waiting until he dies. One of the few men who has served in this body who had that rare privilege

was Judge MANSFIELD. I remember in 1942 on the occasion of his twenty-fifth year of service in this body we paused to pay tribute to him. The Chaplain of the House referred to Judge MANSFIELD as "the concentrated essence of the sunshine of Congress." The entire membership nodded approval when our then Speaker RAYBURN stood in the well of the House and said, "Judge MANSFIELD's life is an inspiration to everyone who knows him. Long may he live to serve his country and to give joy to his thousands of friends."

When I came here 9 years ago I was appointed to serve on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I learned to know Judge MANSFIELD, not as an old man, because one never thought of him as an old man. No man was younger in spirit than he. All the things that have been said about his kindly, wholesome influence, I am sure can be repeated again and again, because they cannot be said too often. I am sure the State of Texas will elect a good man to occupy the seat that he occupied, but there is no one who can take his place because there is just not that kind of person alive.

I am sure it is heartening to our guests today to witness this fine tribute being paid by the Members of this body, regardless of partisanship, to a man who loved his country so dearly. He was not only a great Texan—he was a great American. He knew every river and harbor. He knew every stream and every bridge. He never had to refer to a map in his work. He knew all about what he was doing. Every member of his committee loved him and respected him. I am sure that is true of every Member of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been especially fond of the distinguished gentleman who is gone, and a great admirer of his delightful personality, his stalwart character, and his outstanding ability, I thoroughly share the great bereavement which is felt today not only by every Member of this House but, I am sure, by every person everywhere whose privilege it was to know Judge MANSFIELD. In fact, I seriously doubt whether there ever has been or ever will be a Member of this House who could so thoroughly deserve the superlative complimentary references which have been so generally indulged in relative to Judge MANSFIELD today. Certainly his district, his State, his Nation, and particularly its waterway development, this House and every one of us have suffered a great loss. Certainly there exists a void or vacuum which probably can never be filled. Yet, my colleagues, I am impressed that we should not today dwell too much on our sadness and on our great bereavement, but, on the other hand, that we should think of the great good fortune of his district, his State, his Nation, this House, and ourselves in having been permitted to know, to associate with, to love, and to profit by the great ability of such a man. I am impressed that as we say goodbye to the grandest old Roman of them all, we should do so with a smile on our faces in

appreciation of his great life and of our good fortune in having profited by our association with him, in appreciation of his having been permitted to remain with us until such a ripe old age, and having so completely retained his faculties to the very end, rather than in sadness because of our immediate great bereavement.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. I was privileged to become a member of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors when I came here as a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and I soon came to know the kindly influence of the distinguished chairman of that committee, Judge JOSEPH MANSFIELD, whom we are commemorating here in the House today. Being a member of the minority at that time, I was never made to realize it because of the friendly attitude of Judge MANSFIELD. He recognized me, although a new member, on many occasions during considerations before the committee. He made me feel that I was part of the committee. Although the many years he had served naturally entitled him to superiority, he never exerted that influence in any of the committee deliberations.

I think Judge MANSFIELD's greatness lay in his humility and his modesty. Many days he sat in his wheel chair in the House and greeted us kindly as we came in, and how many of us knew that he perhaps was suffering, suffering severely, but he still had a smile to greet us all. I think that his memory will live long in this Nation. I do not know of any man who was more alert and more conscious of his responsibilities and to the needs of the Nation through the great Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which he was chairman, than was Judge MANSFIELD; and today there exist many lasting monuments to his memory all over the Nation, monuments of constructive work on rivers and harbors, bridges, and inland waterways, that have added to the great wealth and to the comfort and benefit of the people of this Nation.

I want to pay my respects to my good and kindly friend, Judge MANSFIELD, whom I think will never be replaced insofar as his devotion to duty and his consideration for mankind's needs is concerned. The great State of Texas can be comforted in having had a fine and loyal representative in Judge MANSFIELD during his term of service in the House. We will miss him greatly here. May he rest in peace.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all of us have lost a great friend.

We have known Judge MANSFIELD for many years. We have known all the time that he was a great, lovable character. He liked to help other people, he liked to help the Members of his own committee and the other Members of the House, and he liked to do nice little kindly deeds to and for the people back in his district.

Many fine things have been said about Judge MANSFIELD and I am sure that I cannot add any more. When it is all said and done, Judge MANSFIELD was a fine Christian gentleman who lived a life of service to mankind, and the remainder of us in this House can well emulate that fine spirit. I know that his home is in heaven.

I join with his fine, lovable family in the deep sorrow they are now going through.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, there is some kind of mystical affection which binds together Members of this great body that perhaps can be explained by the fact that we are all dedicated to the service of our country. Of course it is true that we do not all think alike on matters of national importance and we argue with vehemence and insistence in defense of our views, but the deep-seated respect that we have for each other endears us to one another. We represent Americans, and America looks to us for leadership.

This mutual respect and esteem which binds us together frequently grows into a sincere and deep affection and that spirit of affection is abundantly manifested here today. All who were privileged to meet the gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, had the most profound respect for him, and one did not need to know him long or be associated with him for any length of time to acquire an affection for him which grew greater and greater as time went by. His gentle manner, his charm and delightful wit, his honest thinking and his wholehearted patriotism could not help but have their effect in bringing about a lasting love for the man. In addition to all this, his deep and abiding interest in the development and preservation of the natural resources of our country was indeed such a part of him that it stamped itself indelibly on one's consciousness. We, his colleagues, drew inspiration from him by merely being in his presence. He was a great man and we mourn our loss.

But, my colleagues, instead of mourning his passing let us rather be happy that we were privileged to know him and to have been associated with him. Let us gain strength in the knowledge that by his force of character and his militant patriotism he set an example of service for us to emulate. He lived a long and useful life on this earth and he now rests secure in the knowledge of work well done. Let us rejoice with our countrymen that such a man was an American and let us strive in the days to come to carry on to the same brave, unselfish, and cheerful spirit that he did, for he was faithful to the last and has earned his crown of life. We are better Americans for having had him as our friend.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the great number of our colleagues who have spoken on the passing of our beloved colleague Judge JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, of

Texas, testifies to the esteem in which he was held by all of us, and the tributes paid by all those who have spoken indicate their realization of the great loss sustained by this Congress and our country in the passing of Judge MANSFIELD.

In thinking of Judge MANSFIELD I am reminded of what Young said: "The man of wisdom is the man of years."

In the passing of our beloved colleague Judge MANSFIELD we have indeed lost a man of wisdom. During the long years of his service in the Congress his ability and leadership was outstanding and recognized, especially with respect to rivers and harbors and flood-control matters, and only recently on the occasion of his birthday we eulogized his service to his State and to his country over the long period that he was chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and on which committee it has been my privilege to serve with him since I have been in the Congress.

Recently, in praising the great work of Judge MANSFIELD, I stated that it was most unusual that recognition was given to the work of a public servant during his lifetime; but the service of Judge MANSFIELD to his State and Nation was recognized by his great State and the Congress when a magnificent dam built in his native State was named in his honor, as a tribute to his memory and in recognition of the great work of Judge MANSFIELD as chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

We will miss the counsel and fellowship of our colleague, and his guidance and wisdom in the Congress and in our committee.

In the passing of Judge MANSFIELD I am again reminded of the words of Longfellow:

Time has laid his hand  
Upon his heart, gently, not smiting it,  
But as a harper lays his open palm  
Upon his harp, to deaden its vibrations.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the great Grecian poet, Homer, said, "We are a part of all we meet." The tributes paid to the memory of Judge MANSFIELD in this House today are evidence that he made an indelible impression on the minds and hearts of all who came within the radiance of his personality. We are better for having known him. To know him was to love him. Only those who have suffered are loved. For years he suffered great bodily handicap. Despite his physical impairment his life was characterized by an unflagging industry, keenness of intellect, fullness of knowledge, and cheerfulness of spirit. He was the living embodiment of many inspiring truths. When the Almighty commissioned Samuel to anoint David, King of Israel, he was directed to reject all of David's stalwart, towering brothers, saying of each: "Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; for the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." Judge MANSFIELD's intellect, his moral and spiritual strength, his goodness of heart made his face to shine.



So long as he lived he was a fountain of light.

Were I so tall as to reach the pole  
And measure the ocean with a span,  
I must be measured by my soul;  
The mind is the standard of the man.

His was a beautiful soul, a great mind. "The bravest are the tenderest; the loving are the daring." No braver man ever served in this House.

When a man dies those who knew him, his neighbors, ask, "What did he leave in this world's goods?" The angels ask, "What good deeds did he send before him?" Only the records of eternity can disclose his countless good deeds.

Judge MANSFIELD was rich in character, rich in service to his fellow man and to his country. Ripe in years, he embodied that old truth: "Gray hairs are a crown of glory when found in the paths of righteousness."

A good man never dies. Judge MANSFIELD is not dead. He lives in the hearts of his sorrowing kin, in the hearts and minds of those who knew him best. He lives in that better world where the spirits of just men are made perfect.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I think the First Psalm must have been written about this great and good man who just left us:

Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.

But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in His law doth he meditate day and night.

And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.

This I do know—the First Psalm was written to urge and encourage all men to lead and to live the fine Christian life which was that of our dear friend and colleague, Judge JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD of the Lone Star State of old Texas.

Judge MANSFIELD was a great, kindly, sympathetic, understanding soul; a great American, a great Texan, who loved and worshipped his God, who loved his family, who loved his Nation, who loved his district and his State, who loved his colleagues, who loved folks. You know, I also believe that the following little verse must have been written about Judge MANSFIELD because of his lovely disposition, his wonderful character, and his true devotion to his fellow man, because he certainly spread sunshine and happiness into the hearts and into the homes of every person with whom he came in contact. I recited this little verse to the Judge on his 85th birthday and he gave me a warm, firm handshake. The twinkle in his eye indicated to me that he liked the thought it expressed:

Making friends is a lot of fun  
Shaking hands with everyone  
Hearing what each has to say  
As we meet them day by day  
Swapping smiles and trading cheer  
Makes us happy while we're here.  
For all the joy of life depends  
On the art of making friends.

Judge MANSFIELD was a master at making and keeping friends. His family indeed should be happy to know that this world is a finer and a better place because Judge MANSFIELD lived here. He has answered his last roll call here in the House of Representatives, but he has gone to answer the roll call of the Master of all legislative bodies, lodges, and men. He will be present there for all time to come. It is his reward for the beautiful life he lived and the example he set here on earth. His courage should be a source of inspiration to all—he overcame his disability to become one of the most active Members on the floor. His wisdom, his vast knowledge, his service to his people are landmarks which are monuments to his achievements.

Judge truly let his light so shine before men that they may see his good works and glorify his Father, who art in heaven.

May God bless and preserve his family forever and a day.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, would that I had the imagination, the gift of foretelling, the utterance of a prophet, that I might picture to you in language expressive and sincere the worth, the dignity, and the character of our beloved friend.

Mr. Speaker, for almost an hour and three-quarters we have listened to beautiful expressions from his fellow Members in tribute to this great man. This is one of the longest memorial services it has ever been my privilege to hear since I have been a Member of this body, and no man has deserved it more. I will always feel sorry for anyone who did not know Judge MANSFIELD, for no one who knew him would ever forget the warmth of his smile, the cheer that came from contact with him, and the inspiration that helped every man with whom he came in contact.

Shortly after I came to Congress, one day he wheeled his way up through the aisle and stopped and said, "Mr. GRAHAM, you come from Beaver, Pa.?" I said, "Yes." He said, "You live beside a beautiful river, the Ohio River." He said, "That was the home of former Senator Quay. Did you know him?" I said, "Yes, I knew him." He said, "When I was superintendent of schools in Texas, Senator Quay taught in my community, and I caused to be erected a memorial to his memory, as a United States Senator who had taught in that section."

I cite this to show you the universality of this man, his wide knowledge of every Member of this Congress, of his home, of his locality, of his friends and associates, and of the noted characters who had come from his community.

I always think that each man has a phrase that expresses him. A moment ago he was referred to as "a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season." I shall think of him in terms of another expression from the psalm, as one "who passing through the valley of Baca make it a well."

Then, Mr. Speaker, as I stand almost beneath the star of Texas, the lone star of Texas, I am thinking what was the lone star of his life, the guiding purpose of his life. It was a deep, undying faith in his fellow man and love of his God and of genuine Americanism, that made him the peer of all around him.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, it is always good to rest in the shadow of a sturdy oak when we are tired and careworn and borne down by the burdens of our responsibilities, or when we are young and life looms out ahead of us in good expectancy. I have shared both of these experiences with Judge MANSFIELD. I hope you will pardon a personal reference, but I was assigned to serve on the Committee on Public Works, which includes rivers and harbors, and served with Judge MANSFIELD from January 17 to the time that he became ill and went to the hospital. On his eighty-sixth birthday my son, a quiet, tow-headed young soldier, was on his way to his assignment at Fort Clayton in the Canal Zone and had come by to visit his mother and me on the way. I told him that we were having a birthday party for Judge MANSFIELD over at the Public Works Committee room and asked him if he would like to go. He did. We went there and took along a box of candy as a little gift. I introduced the lad to the Judge. Judge MANSFIELD patted my boy on the arm and said, "Son, you look like a good soldier to me." We visited awhile at the party and returned to the office. The lad did not say much. But on the way back he said, "Dad, you know I like Judge MANSFIELD. One just can't afford to let a man like that down."

I am grateful for that experience for my son, whose life is out before him. He had rested in the shadow of the great oak and had caught his spirit.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members have referred to their friendship for Judge MANSFIELD and to the splendid work that he has performed for the Nation. It is not surprising that many of our colleagues should make reference to the same attributes of this great man because he always treated each of us with the same courteous respect and loving kindness.

If there ever was a man in the House of Representatives who all viewed in the same light, it was Judge MANSFIELD. There are so many of us who are viewed in one light by some and in still another light by others. To our friends most of us are heroes. To those who are not our friends, we may be villains. Judge MANSFIELD had only friends, and he himself was the friend of all.

Reference has been made to his long life and public service. I recall that he often liked to tell that he was born in the State of Virginia, but that his birthplace was not in Virginia but rather that it was in West Virginia since the State of West Virginia came into existence after his birth. There are few who can point

to so long a life and I know of none who can point to a longer life of public service. Two-thirds of this long span of life Judge MANSFIELD devoted to his country. Certainly none can show such a long life of service without having been worthy of public respect. Our democracy demands service of the highest order of those it continues in public office so long.

We know of the material monuments that have been erected to our departed friend. Reference has been made to the great dam on the Colorado River in the State of Texas which bears his name, but that is only one of the hundreds of river development projects all over the United States that could well bear his name. His monuments are written in all the major streams and all the teeming harbors of America. There you will find tangible monuments to the material work of Judge MANSFIELD.

But it was not the material work, great as it was, that endeared him to those of us who know him here. As a citizen of Texas and as a member of the legislative body of that State, I had, of course, known Judge MANSFIELD years before I became a Member of this body. But it was only after having the opportunity to know him personally, to deal with him day by day, to know something of his ever-present kindness, his willingness to help, that I had any opportunity to understand why those who had known him longer held him in such deep affection. Affection is the only word we can use to describe our association with Judge MANSFIELD. Everybody respected him. We all respect those who accomplish great things, but we can only love those who love the rest of mankind. That is what made Judge MANSFIELD so really great.

It seems to me that the reason so many of us have found it so difficult to express the thoughts in our hearts today has been that we want to express more than mere appreciation for the great work that he did for his State and his Nation. We want to express, even where we are unable to do so, our own feelings of appreciation and love for his kindness and his love for every Member of the House as well as for all who came in contact with him. As he embarks on that journey from which no traveler returns, he carries to that brighter shore love and good wishes of all those he left behind.

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of one of the most lovable and genuine men I have ever known. Never in my life have I known a man who was so constantly bright and cheerful and friendly. Although a wheel chair confined him physically, it was never sufficient to restrict his greatness. Time after time I have marveled at his tremendous energy and the unusual skill with which he handled legislation entrusted to him as chairman of one of our great committees. For over 60 years he enjoyed the implicit confidence of his electorate. Honor after honor came to him from his people. No greater tribute could be paid to any man. A great loss has been sustained by his constituency, by the State

of Texas, and by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the death of Judge MANSFIELD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues of the House in paying tribute to the memory of the Honorable J. J. MANSFIELD, whose passing last Saturday morning has saddened the hearts of all of us who knew him.

First of all, the State of Texas and the Nation as a whole has lost a truly great and good public servant. It is not too much to say that for more than a quarter of a century no man in the Congress did more for the improvement of our waterways, our rivers and harbors, and their utilization for commerce and trade than Judge MANSFIELD. He believed devoutly in harnessing the floodwaters and converting their destructive force to the beneficial use of our people. He believed in the principle that these God-given streams and waterways, wherever situated, belong to all of the people of our Nation, and therefore should be developed by the Government for the use of all the people.

Gifted with a keen and alert mind, a noble concept of public duty, and boundless energy, he devoted them all to the service of the people. As chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, his amazing knowledge of waterway problems and the high esteem in which he was held by his colleagues of both parties made him an inspiring leader for waterway development. He was ever alert to keep considerations of narrow partisanship from dividing the members of his committee or influencing their decisions concerning waterway improvements. The great river and harbor, flood-control, and other waterway improvements throughout this Nation during the 16 years he served as chairman attest the vision and effectiveness of his leadership.

Judge MANSFIELD devoted nearly 60 years of his long and useful life to public service. He was city attorney and mayor of Eagle Lake, and county Judge of Colorado County for 20 years before coming to Congress. He was interested also in civic and fraternal work, serving as grand master of Masons in Texas during the years of 1913-14. To all of these tasks he devoted his heart, mind, and energy.

But great as were his accomplishments as a Member of Congress, his colleagues in this House will remember him best for his sterling character, his genial good humor, and his unselfish friendship. For, in spite of a physical infirmity which handicapped him for many years, he never ceased to have an optimistic outlook on life, nor did he fail to extend a warm hand of greeting and a friendly smile to all he met. His alert and active mind, his noble character, and sunny disposition made him one of the most inspiring characters I ever knew. A truly great man has passed to his reward. But

in doing so he has left for us an inspiring example of unselfish public service worthy of our emulation, and the memory of a true and noble friendship.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Judge MANSFIELD, whose death we mourn and whose memory we revere, has been stricken from our midst by the Grim Reaper. He served continuously in public office for a period of more than a half a century. That is a record of public service and evidence of public esteem seldom equaled and rarely exceeded in the annals of our history.

When I came to the Seventy-eighth Congress I was given an assignment on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which Mr. MANSFIELD was chairman. There I had the privilege of observing him as he presided in a manner that commanded the absolute respect of every member of the committee, regardless of party affiliation. His expert knowledge of the smallest details of river and harbor works at any point around our thousands of miles of shore line was simply amazing.

Mr. Speaker, others have paid tribute to Mr. MANSFIELD's character, his high sense of fairness, his fine sense of humor, his outstanding statesmanship, and his devotion to his trust. I shall not dwell upon them. I can only say that a man so completely free of demagoguery, so faithful in his service to the public, lived a life that we can all do well to emulate. The world is a little darker because his light has gone out. The world is a little colder now that his heart has grown cold in death. But his memory lives and his example shines like a beacon light on the hillside.

Statesman, yet friend to truth; of soul sincere,

In action faithful and in honor clear;  
Who broke no promise, served no private end,  
Who gained no title, and who lost no friend.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a real privilege to have served in Congress with Judge MANSFIELD. Judge MANSFIELD was loved and appreciated to the same extent by all his friends who knew him well—to the fullest extent. Indeed, to know him was to love him and to name him was to praise him.

Last summer I visited his home at Columbus, Tex. It is an humble and simple home. Truthfully it may be said of him in the words of the poet:

Far from his rank he neither sank nor soared,  
But sat an equal guest at every board.  
No beggar ever felt him condescend  
No prince presume for still himself he bore  
at manhood's simple level  
And where e'er he met a stranger there he left a friend.

I know he did justly, loved mercy and walked humbly with his God and fellow man.

Judge MANSFIELD was an outstanding Member of Congress for his district, Texas and the Nation. He worked in behalf of projects and fought for causes that will benefit his Nation for many years to come.

The efforts of and life lived by the deceased constitute an excellent example of what can be accomplished by one who is handicapped. In fact, insofar as his usefulness to his district and nation was



concerned, he mastered completely his handicap. His mind was alert always, his spirit was never bent.

Judge MANSFIELD fought a good fight, he kept the faith, he has finished his course; that his reward will be great we have no doubt.

To his family we express our sincere sympathy. You have lost a devoted and true father and kinsman. His district, Texas and the nation have lost a statesman of vision and a tireless worker for good and better things for all the people. We who knew and loved him here have lost a warm, valued and true friend.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the expressions of sorrow at the passing of our distinguished friend and colleague, Judge JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD. During my service here I have not known a member more universally loved and respected than he. His was a long and fruitful public service. Notwithstanding his advanced age and the physical handicap which he suffered, he remained active and vigorous, his mind as keen as any man much his junior. I doubt if many members can boast of a better attendance record than his.

His principal interest was the waterways, the rivers and harbors of the country. Not so long ago I was amazed to hear him recite from memory the principal characteristics of the major ports and harbors of the country. He knew their depth, their dock facilities, their tonnage capacity, the nature of the freight moving through them and every other detail. His work as member and chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has left a permanent mark upon those facilities.

During the years that I knew him I never saw anything of anger or resentment in his nature. He was always in good humor and the best of spirits. Though his physical disability may have justified otherwise there was no bitterness, but the acceptance of his condition.

For more than 60 consecutive years he had served his people well and faithfully. His enthusiasm for their rights and their interests was as strong as the end approached as it was when he first began representing them. The tribute I would like to pay him at this time is, in my opinion, a high one. It is simply that his district, his State, and his Nation are better because he lived.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, no man could know JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD without entertaining for him a profound admiration and deep affection. His quiet influence extended far beyond the limits of his professional and political associations. His devotion to the public service was a great inspiration to every Member of the House.

He accepted his honors with modesty and complete naturalness, yet he responded with warmth and appreciation to every display of friendship. His leadership in his special field has made a lasting impression upon our Nation. The House will never seem the same without him and we all join our colleagues from the great State of Texas in mourning the passing of our beloved friend, Judge MANSFIELD.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 291).

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, a Representative from the State of Texas.

*Resolved*, That a committee of five Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following committee: Mr. PATMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COMBS, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. CLIPPINGER.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until tomorrow, July 15, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

925. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the construction of a road connecting the Kenai Peninsula, Alaska, with the central road system of the Territory; to the Committee on Public Works.

926. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize temporary aid to and repatriation of nationals of the United States in need in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 288. Resolution providing for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 123, joint resolution to terminate certain emergency and war powers; without amendment (Rept. No. 902). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 289. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4102, a bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 903). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 290. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R.

3043, a bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 904). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURKE: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4108. A bill to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3370. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than \$3.10 per hundred pounds; with an amendment (Rept. No. 906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAGEN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4109. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916; with amendments (Rept. No. 908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1109. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States and Territories as may be needed for the burial of war veterans and certain other persons as provided for in section 281, title 24, United States Code, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1597. A bill to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2502. A bill to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon; with amendments (Rept. No. 911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2867. A bill to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Tsukado Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 4183. A bill to prescribe the pay and allowances of aviation cadets in the Air Corps, Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4184. A bill to amend Public Law No. 26, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31,

1947, to provide for additional functions, duties, and employees in the Office of Selective Service Records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 4185. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil conservation and leveling land used or to be used in farming operations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4186. A bill to prohibit and punish the unauthorized use of the official seal, emblem, and name of the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4187. A bill to amend subsection (d) of section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 4188. A bill to provide that Members of Congress may act as notaries public during their terms of office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4189. A bill to provide for the deportation of certain aliens eligible to citizenship who do not take action to become citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4190. A bill to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 4191. A bill to authorize the construction of the Klickitat unit of the Wapato project, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4192. A bill to amend paragraph (A) (1) of Public Law No. 662, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 869, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4193. A bill to guarantee that the civil liberties of labor shall not be abridged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4194. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 4195. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4196. A bill to incorporate the Society of the First Division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 4197. A bill to further amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to clarify the meaning of references in the act of number of employees supervised and size of organization unit; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the bill (H. R. 2319) the National Security Act of 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4198. A bill for the relief of Miss Denise Simone Bouttant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4199. A bill for the relief of George Haniotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

741. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Johanna Hansjacob, St. Petersburg, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

742. Also, petition of Miss Martha Moffitt, Sanford, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

743. Also, petition of Miss Sue Laverents, Jacksonville, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

744. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Catholic War Veterans, St. Helena Post, No. 202, urging enactment of H. R. 1981 to make Good Friday a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 15, 1947

Rev. Clarence Cranford, D. D., minister, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

In these days of stress and strain, O God, give us a faith and a wisdom that can match the problems of this hour. Believing it is "not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord," help us to give attention to those moral and spiritual goals without which our material progress is in vain and our scientific advancement can become a curse rather than a blessing.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 14, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 179. An act for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffield;

S. 403. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gideon Peon;

S. 484. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joseph J. Pickett a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 558. An act for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo;

S. 880. An act for the relief of Rev. John C. Young;

S. 924. An act to credit active service in the military or naval forces of the United States in determining eligibility for and the amount of benefits from the policemen and firemen's relief fund, District of Columbia;

S. 1360. An act for the relief of Eric Seddon;

S. 1402. An act to authorize the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia to establish bylaws governing the election of their vestrymen; and

S. 1462. An act to authorize the official reporters of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to collect fees for transcripts, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3493) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, and 110 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 78 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3993) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 14 and 17 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 12 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. WHITTEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

## ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1419. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue sewer bonds;

H. R. 3950. An act to reduce individual income-tax payments; and